SCS #1583

Thomas F. Torrance

SCJ #1583

AARONS ROD BLOSSOMING.

OR,

The Divine Ordinance of Church-Government VINDICATED,

So as the present Erastian Controversie concerning the distinction of Civill and Ecclesiasticall Government, Excommunication, and Suspension, is fully debated and discussed, from the holy Scripture, from the Jewish and Christian Antiquities, from the consent of latter Writers, from the true nature and rights of Magistracy, and from the groundlesnesse of the chiefe Objections made against the Presbyteriall Government in point of a domineering arbitrary unlimited power.

By *George Gillespie* Minister at *Edinburgh*.

For unto us a child is born, unto us a sonne is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder. Isaiah 9. 6.

Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, 1 Tim. 5. 17.

And the spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets, for God is not the Author of confusion but of peace. 1 Cor. 14 32, 33.

August. lib. contra Donatistas post collationem, Cap. 4.

Ne fortè aut indisciplinata patientia foveat iniquitatem, aut impatiens disciplina dissipet unitatem.

Published by Authority.

London, Printed by E. G. for *Richard Whitaker*, at the signe of the Kings Armes in *Pauls* Church-yard. 1646.

James Hay his Book – Alyth 13th. August 1804

TO THE

Reverend and Learned Assembly of DIVINES Convened at WESTMINSTER.

Right Reverend,

THough many faithfull servants of God did long agoe desire to see those things which we see, and to heare those things which we heare; Yet it hath been one of the speciall mercies reserved for this Generation, and denied to the times of our Ancestors, that Divines of both Kingdomes within this Island, should be gathered and continued together, to consult peaceably and freely concerning a Reformation of Religion

in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government. 'Tis a mercy yet greater, that two Nations formerly at so great a distance in the form of publike Worship and Churchgovernment, should (to their mutuall comfort and happines, and to the further endearing of each to other) through the good hand of God be now agreed upon one Directory of Worship, and with a good progresse advanced, as in one Confession of Faith, so likewise in one forme of Church-government. For all which, as the other Reformed Churches, (in regard of their common interest in the Truth and Ordinances of Christ) so especially your Brethren in the Church of *Scotland* are your debters: Your name is as precious Oynment among them, and they doe esteeme you very highly in love for your workes sake. A worke, which as it is extraordinary and unparalleld, requiring a double portion of the Spirit of your Master, so You have very many Hearts and Prayers going along with you in it, that the pleasure of the Lord may prosper in your hand.

As for my Reverend Colleagues and my selfe, it hath been a good part of our happinesse

pineſſe that we have been partakers of, and Aſſiſtants in your grave and learned Debates. Yet (as we declared from our firſt comming amongſt you,) we came not hither preſuming to preſcribe any thing unto You, but willing to receive as well as to offer light, and to debate matters freely and fairely from the Word of God, the common Rule both to you and us. As herein You were pleaſed to give teſtimony unto us in one of your Letters to the Generall Aſſembly of the Church of *Scotland*, ſo the great reſpects which in other things and at other times you have expreſſed, both towards that Church from which we are entruſted, and particularly towards our ſelves, doe call for a returne of all poſſible and publique teſtimonies of gratitude. For which purpoſe, I doe for my part take hold of this opportunity. I know that I owe much more unto You, then I have either ability to pay, or Elocution to ſet forth. Yet although I cannot retaliate your Favours, nor render that which may be worthy of your ſelves; I beſeech you to accept this part of my retribution of reſpects. I doe offer and entitle unto You this Enucleation of the E-

raſtian

rastian Controversie, which is *Dignus vindice nodus*. I hope here is a word in season concerning it. Others might have done better, but such furniture as I had, I have brought to the worke of the Tabernacle. I submit what is mine unto your greater learning and better judgement, and shall ever continue

Yours to serve you,

GEO. GILLESPIE.

To

To the Candid Reader.

I Have often and heartily wiſhed that I might not be diſtracted by nor ingaged into polemick Writings, of which the World is too full already, and from which many more learned and idoneous have abſtained; and I did accordingly reſolve that in this Controverſall age I ſhould be ſlow to write, ſwift to read and learne. Yet there are certaine preponderating reaſons which have made me willing to be drawn forth into the light upon this ſubject. For beſide the deſires and ſollicitations of diverſe Chriſtian friends, lovers of truth and peace, ſeriouſly calling upon me for an anſwer to Mr Prynne *his* Vindication *of his foure Queſtions concerning* Excommunication and Suſpenſion, *the*

the grand importance of the Eraſtian controverſie, and the ſtrong influence which it hath into the preſent juncture of affaires, doth powerfully invite me.

Among the many Controverſies which have diſquieted and moleſted the Church of Chriſt, thoſe concerning Eccleſiaſticall Government and Diſcipline are not the leaſt, but among the chiefe, and often mannaged with the greateſt animoſity and eagerneſſe of ſpirit, whence there have growne moſt dangerous diviſions and breaches, ſuch as this day there are, and for the future are to be expected, unleſſe there ſhall be (through Gods mercy) ſome further compoſing and healing of theſe Church-conſuming diſtractions: which if we ſhall be ſo happy as once to obtaine, it will certainely contribute very much toward the accommodation of civill and State-ſhaking differences. And contrariwiſe, if no healing for the Church, no healing for the State. Let the Gallio's *of this time (who care for no intrinſecall evill in the Church) promiſe to themſelves what they will, ſurely he that ſhall have cauſe to write with* Nicolaus de Clemangis, *a Booke of lamentation* de corrupto Eccleſiæ ſtatu, *will finde alſo cauſe to write with him* de lapſu & reparatione Juſtitiæ. *As*

As the thing is of high concernment to these so much disturbed and divided Churches, so the elevation is yet higher by many degrees; This controversie reacheth up to the Heavens, and the top of it is above the clouds. It doth highly concerne Jesus Christ himselfe, in his glory, royall prerogative, and kingdome, which he hath and exerciseth as Mediator and Head of his Church. The Crowne of Jesus Christ, or any part, privilege, or pendicle thereof must needs be a noble and excellent Subject. This truth that Jesus Christ is a King, and hath a Kingdome and government in his Church, distinct from the kingdomes of this World, and from the civill Government, hath this commendation and character above all other truths, that Christ himselfe suffered to the death for it, and sealed it with his blood. For it may be observed from the story of his Passion, [a] *this was the onely point of his accusation, which was confessed and avouched by himselfe,* [b] *was most aggravated, prosecuted, and driven home by the Jewes,* [c] *was prevalent with* Pilate *as the cause of condemning him to die, and* [d] *was mentioned also in the superscription upon his crosse. And although in reference to God, and in respect of satisfaction to the Divine justice for our sinnes, his death was* λύτρον *a price of redemption,*

[a] Luke 23.3. John 18.33,36 37.
[b] Luke 23.2. John 19.12,15.
[c] Joh. 19.12,13
[d] John 19.19.

yet in reference to men who did persecute, accuse, and condemne him, his death was μαρτύριον, *a Martyrs Testimony to seale such a truth. This Kingly Office of Jesus Christ (as well as his Propheticall) is administred and exercised, not onely inwardly and invisibly by the working of his Spirit in the soules of particular persons, but outwardly also and visibly in the Church, as a visible politicall ministeriall body, in which he hath appointed his own proper Officers, Ambassadours, Courts, Lawes, Ordinances, Censures, and all these administrations, to be in his own name, as the onely King and Head of the Church. This was the thing which* Herod *and* Pilate *did, and many Princes, Potentates, and States doe looke upon, with so much feare and jealousie, as another Government coordinate with the civill. But what was darke upon the one side to them, hath been light upon the other side to those servants of Jesus Christ who have stood, contended, and sometime suffered much for the Ordinance of Church-Government and Discipline, which they looked upon as a part of Christs Kingdome. So* [e] Bucer.

[a] *De regno Christi lib* 1. *cap* 4 Non defuerunt quoque intra hos triginta annos, præsertim in Germania, qui viderit voluerunt justum Evangelii prædicationem planè amplecti &c. verum perpauci adhuc reperti sunt qui se Christi Evangelio & regno omnino subjecissent: imo qui passi fuissent Christi religionem & Ecclesiarum Disciplinam restitui per omnia juxta leges Regis nostri. *Et infra* In Hungaria, gratia Domino, non paucæ jam existunt Ecclesiæ quæ cum purâ Christi doctrinâ, solidam etiam ejus disciplinam receperunt, custodiuntque religiosè. Rex noster Christus faxit ut harum Ecclesiarum exemplum quàm plurimæ sequantur.

So,

So [f] Parker. *So* [g] *M.* Welsch *my countreyman of precious memory, who suffered much for the same truth, and was ready to seale it with his blood. Beside divers others who might be named, especially learned* Didoclavius *in his* Altare Damascenum Cap. 1. *and throughout.*

[f] *De polit. Eccl. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. Politeia Eccl siastica est pa regni Christi.

[g] *M. John Welsh* his Letter to the Lady *Fleeming*, written from his priso at *Blackn sse* i January 1616. Who am I that he should first have called me and then constituted me a Minister of glad things, of the Gospell of salvation these fifteen yeeres already, and now last of all to be a sufferer for his cause and kingdome, to witnesse that good confession that Jesus Christ is the King of Saints, and that his Church is a most free Kingdome, yea as free as any Kingdome under Heaven, not onely to convocate hold and keepe her meetings, conventions, and assemblies, but also to judge of all her affaires, in all her meetings and conventions, among his Members and Subjects! These two points, that Christ is the head of his Church, Secondly that she is free in her government from all other Jurisdiction except Christs; these two points are the speciall cause of our imprisonment, being now convict as traytors for maintaining thereof. We have been waiting with joyfulnesse to give the last testimony of our blood in confirmation thereof, if it would please our God to be so favourable as to honour us with that dignity. *Thus he.*

I am not ignorant that some have an evill eye upon all government in a Nation, distinct from civill Magistracy, and if it were in their power they would have all Anti-Erastians (and so consequently both Presbyterians and Independents) lookt upon as guilty of Treason, at least, as violaters of, and encroachers upon the rights and priviledges of Magistracy, in respect of a distinct Ecclesiasticall government. And indeed it is no new thing for the most faithfull Ministers of Jesus Christ to be reproached and accused as guilty of Treason, which was not onely the lot of M. Calderwood,

and (as hath been now shewed) of M. Welsch, *and those that suffered with him,* [h] *but of* M. Knox *before them, as likewise of many Martyrs and confessors, and* [i] *of the Apostles themselves. Yet (if we will judge righteous judgement, and weigh things in a just ballance) we doe not rob the Magistrate of that which is his, by giving unto Christ that which is Christs. We desire to hold up the honour and greatnesse, the power and authority of Magistracy, against Papists, Anabaptists, and all others* [k] *that* despise dominion, and speake evill of dignities. *We doe not* [l] *compare (as* Innocentius *did) the civill and the ecclesiasticall powers, to the two great lights, that to the Moone, this to the Sunne. We hold* [m] it is proper to Kings, Princes and Magistrates, to be called Lords, and Dominators over their Subjects whom they governe civilly, but it is proper to Christ onely to be called Lord and Master in the Spirituall government of the Church; and all others that beare office therein, ought not to usurpe Dominion therein, nor be called Lords, but onely Ministers, Disciples and Servants. *We acknowledge and affirme* [n] *that Magistracy and civill Government in Empires, Kingdomes, Dominions, and Cities, is an Ordinance of God*

[h] Discourse of the troubles at Frankeford first published in the yeere 1575 and reprinted at London in the yeere 642. pag. 37.

[i] Acts 17.6,7. Jude ep. v. 8.

[k] Fr. à S. Clara Apolog. Episcop. cap. 2.

[l] The second booke of the Discipline of the Church of Scotland, cap. 1.

[n] The confession of faith of the Church of Scotland Art. 25

God for his owne glory, and for the great good of mankind, so that whoever are enemies to Magistracy, they are enemies to mankind and to the revealed will of God: [o] That such persons as are placed in authority, are to be beloved, honoured, feared, and holden in a most reverend estimation, because they are the Lieutenants of God, in whose seat God himselfe doth sit and judge; *We teach* [p] that not onely they are appointed for civill policy, but also for maintenance of the true Religion, and for suppressing of Idolatry and superstition whatsoever. *We confesse* [q] that such as resist the supreame power, doing that thing which appertaineth to his charge, doe resist Gods Ordinance; and therefore cannot be guiltlesse. And further we affirme, that whosoever deny unto them their ayd, counsell and comfort, whilest the Princes and Rulers vigilantly travell in execution of their Office, that the same men deny their help, support, and counsell to God, who by the presence of his Lieutenant doth crave it of them. *We know and believe,* [r] that though we be free, we ought wholly in a true faith holily to submit our selves to the Magistrate, both with our body

o *Ibid.*

p *Ibid.*

q *Ibid.*

r The Confession of *Helvetia* in the head of Magistracy.

body, and with all our goods, and endeavour of mind, alſo to performe faithfulneſſe, and the oath which we made to him, ſo far forth as his government is not evidently repugnant to him for whoſe ſake we doe reverence the Magiſtrate. [f] *That we ought to yeeld unto Kings and other Magiſtrates in their owne ſtations, feare, honour, tribute, and cuſtome, whether they be good men or evill, as likewiſe to obey them, in that which is not contrary to the Word of God: It being alwaies provided that in things pertaining to our ſoules and conſciences, we obey God onely and his holy Word.* *We believe* [t] *that God hath* delivered the Sword into the hands of the Magiſtrates, to wit, that offences may be repreſſed, not onely thoſe which are committed againſt the ſecond Table, but alſo againſt the firſt. *We doe agree and avouch,* [u] *that* all men of what dignity, condition, or ſtate ſoever they be, ought to be ſubject to their lawfull Magiſtrates, and pay unto them Subſidies and Tributes, and obey them in all things which are not repugnant to the word of God. Alſo they muſt poure out their prayers for them, that God would vouchſafe to direct them in all their actions, and that we may lead a peace-

f The confeſſion of *Bohemia* cap. 16.

t The French confeſsion Art. 39.

u The confeſſion of *Belgia* Art. 36.

peaceable and quiet life under them, with all godlineſſe and honeſty. *We teach*[x] *that it doth belong to the authority and duty of the Magiſtrate, to forbid and (if need be) to puniſh ſuch ſinnes as are committed againſt* the ten Commandements or the Law naturall: *as likewiſe* to adde unto the Law naturall ſome other lawes, defining the circumſtances of the naturall Law, and to keepe and maintaine the ſame by puniſhing the tranſgreſſors. *We hold*[y] *that* the lawes of the Realme may puniſh Chriſtian men with death, for heynous and grievous offences. *And* that it is lawfull for Chriſtian men, at the command of the Magiſtrate, to beare Armes, and to ſerve in juſt warres. *All theſe things we doe ſincerely, really, conſtantly, faithfully, and cheerfully yeeld unto and aſſert in behalfe of the civill Magiſtrate. So that the cauſe which I now take in hand doth not depreſſe but exalt, doth not weaken but ſtrengthen Magiſtracy. I doe not plead againſt* the power of the Sword *when I plead for*[z] the power of the Keys. *Theſe two are moſt diſtinct, they ought not to be confounded, neither need they to claſh or interfeere between themſelves. The controverſie is not about taking from the Magiſtrate what is his, but about giving*

[x] The confeſſion of *Saxony*, Art. 23.

[y] Iriſh Articles of Religion Art. 61, 62.

[z] Matth. 16, 19. & 18. 18. which is meant of laying on or taking of Church cenſure. *Auguſt. Tract. 50. in Jo. Si autem in Eccleſiâ fit, ut quæ in terrâ ligantur in cælo ligentur, & quæ ſolvuntur in terrâ, ſolvantur in cælo: quia cum excommunicat Eccleſia, in cælo ligatur excommunicatus: cum reconciliatur ab Eccleſiâ, in cælo ſolvitur reconciliatus, &c.*

giving to Christ that which is his. We hold a reciprocall subordination of persons, but a coordination of powers.[a] As the Ministers and others of the Ecclesiastical estate are subject to the Magistrate civill, so ought the person of the Magistrate be subject to the Church Spiritually, and in Ecclesiasticall government. And the exercise of both these jurisdictions cannot stand in one person ordinarily. *Againe,* [b] The Magistrate neither ought to preach, minister the Sacraments, nor execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done, but command the Ministers to observe the rule commanded in the Word, and punish the transgressors by civill meanes. The Ministers exerce not the civill Jurisdiction, but teach the Magistrate, how it should be exercised according to the word. [c] *The Laws and Statutes of* Geneva *doe at once ratifie the Ecclesiasticall Presbyteriall power of Jurisdiction or censure, and withall appoint that Ministers shall not take upon them any civill jurisdiction, but where there shall be need of compulsion or civill punishments, that this be done by the Magistrate. Yea, under a Popish Magistrate (as in* France*) and even under the Turke himselfe,*

[a] The second Booke of the Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*, cap. 1.

[c] See the Laws and Statutes of *Geneva* translated out of the French and printed at *London* 1643. pag. 9, 10.

ſelfe many Churches doe enjoy not onely the Word and Sacraments, but a free Church government and Diſcipline within themſelves, rectio diſciplinæ libera, *which is thought no prejudice to the civill government, they that governe the Churches having no dominion nor ſhare of Magiſtracy.* Vide D. Chytræi orat. de ſtatu Eccleſiarum in Græcia &c.

I know well, that there are other horrid calumnies and miſ-repreſentations of Presbyteriall Government, beſides that of encroaching upon Magiſtracy: but they are as falſe *as they are* foule. *And although we goe upon this diſadvantage* [d] *which* Demoſthenes (*being loadened with a heavy charge and grievous aſperſions by* [e] Æſchines) *did complaine of, that though by right both parties ſhould be heard, yet the generality of men doe with pleaſure hearken to reproaches and calumnies, but take little or no pleaſure to heare mens clearing of themſelves or their cauſe; and that his adverſary had choſen that which was more pleaſant, leaving to him that which was more tedious: Nevertheleſſe I muſt needs expect from all ſuch as are conſcionable and faithfull in this Cauſe and Covenant, that their eares ſhall not be open to calumnies, and ſhut upon more favou-*

[d] *De corona orat. 5. in initio*

[e] *In orat. contra Cteſiphontem.*

rable informations. And however, let the worſt be ſaid which malice it ſelfe can deviſe, it ſhall be no ſmall comfort to me, that our Lord and Maſter f Matth. 5 11. *hath ſaid,* f Bleſſed are ye when men ſhall revile you, and perſecute you, and ſhal ſay all manner of evill againſt you falſely for my names ſake.

I know alſo that a Government and Diſcipline in the Church (the thing which I now undertake to plead for) is a very diſpleaſing thing g *to thoſe that would faine enjoy liberty either of pernicious errors, or groſſe prophanneſſe. But (as* Maimonides *ſaith well)* we muſt not judge of the eaſineſſe or heavineſſe of a Law according to the affections and luſt of any evill man, being raſh (*in judgement*) and given to the worſt vices; but according to the underſtanding of one who is moſt perfect among men, like unto whom, according to the Law, all others ought to be. More Nevochim part. 2. Cap. 39. *No marvell the licentious hate that way wherein they ſhall finde themſelves hemmed in, if not hedged up with thornes. And that they may the more flatter themſelves in their ſinfull licentiouſneſſe, they imagine that Chriſts yoke is eaſie and his burthen light, to the fleſh as well as to the Spirit, to carnall as well as to ſpirituall men. For my*

g Pſalm 2. 3. Luke 13. 14.

part

part if I have learned Christ aright, I hold it for a sure principle, that in so farre as a man is spirituall and regenerate, in as farre his flesh is under a yoake; and in so farre as he is unregenerate, in as farre his flesh is sine jugo *without a yoke. The* [h] *healing of the spirit is not without the smiting of the flesh.*

h *Origen. in Levit. Hom. 3. Quid percutit? carnem. Quid sanat? Spiritum. Prorsus ut illa deficiat, iste proficiat.*

When I speake of this Divine Ordinance of Church Government, my meaning is not to allow, muchlesse to animate any in the too severe and over strict exercise of Ecclesiasticall discipline and censures. It was observed by [i] Hierome, *as one of the errors of the* Montanists: Illi ad omne pene delictum Ecclesiæ obserant fores. They shut the Church doore, (*that is, they excommunicate and shut out of the Church*) almost at every offence. *I confesse the greater part are more apt to faile in the defect, then in the excesse, and are like to come too short, rather than to goe too farre. Yet a failing there may be, and hath been both waies. The best things, whether in Church or State, have been actually abused, and may be so againe, through the error and corruption of men. The holy Scripture it selfe is abused to the greatest mischiefes in the world, though in its owne nature it serves for the greatest good in the world. The abuse of a thing*

i *Hier. ad Marcellum.*

which is neceſſary, and eſpecially of a divine Ordinance, whether ſuch abuſe be feared or felt, ought not, may not prejudice the thing it ſelfe. My purpoſe and endeavour ſhall be (wherein I beſeech the Lord to help my infirmities) to own the thing, to diſowne the abuſes of the thing, to point out the path of Chriſts Ordinance, without allowing either rigour againſt ſuch as ought to be tenderly dealt with, or too much lenity towards ſuch as muſt be ſaved with feare, and pulled out of the fire, or at all any aberration to the right or left hand.

I have had much adoe to gaine ſo many horæ ſubciſivæ *from the works of my publique calling, as might ſuffice for this worke. I confeſſe it hath coſt me much paines, and I thinke I may ſay without preſumption, he that will goe about ſolidly to anſwer it, will finde it no eaſie matter. Subitane lucubrations will not doe it. But if any man ſhall by unanſwerable contrary reaſons or evidences diſcover error or miſtake in any of my principles, let truth have the victory, let God have the glory. Onely this favour (I may ſay this juſtice) I ſhall proteſt for. Firſt, that my principles and concluſions may be rightly apprehended, and that I may not be charged with any abſurd, dangerous or odious aſſertion, unleſſe my own words be faithfully cited*

from

from which that assertion shall be gathered, yea also without concealing my explanations, qualifications, or restrictions, if any such there be. Which rule to my best observation I have not transgressed, in reference to the Opposites. Secondly, that as I have not dealt with their Nauci, *but with their* Nucleus, *I have not scratched at their shell, but taken out their kernell (such as it is) I have not declined them, but encountered, yea sought them out, where their strength was greatest, where their Arguments were hardest, and their exceptions most probable: so no man may decline or dissemble the strength of my Arguments, Inferences, Authorities, Answers and Replies, nor thinke it enough to lift up an Axe against the uttermost branches, when he ought to strike at the root. Thirdly, if there be any acrimony, let it be in a reall and rationall conviction, not in the manner of expression. In which also I aske no other measure to my selfe than I have given to others. Tis but in vaine for a man to help the bluntnesse of* reason *with the sharpnesse of* passion: *for thereby he loseth more than he gaineth with intelligent Readers: the simpler sort may peradventure esteem those* ἀξιομισήτα, *those deplicable nothings, to be something, but then they are* deluded, *not* edified. *Therefore let not a man cast forth*

a flood of passionate words, when his Arguments are like broken cisternes which can hold no water.

If any Replyer there be of the Erastian party, who will confine himselfe within these Rules and Conditions, as I doe not challenge him, so (if God spare me life and liberty) I will not refuse him. But if any shall so reply as to prevaricate and doe contrary to these just and reasonable demands, I must (to his greater shame) call him to the Orders, and make his tergiversation to appeare.

I shall detaine thee (good Reader) no longer. The Lord guide thee and all his people in waies of truth and peace, holinesse and righteousnesse, and grant that this Controversie may (I trust it shall) have a happy end to the glory of God, to the embracing and exalting of Jesus Christ in his Kingly Office, to the ordering of his House according to His owne will, to the keeping pure of the Ordinances, to the advancing of Holinesse, and shaming of prophanesse, and finally to the peace, quiet, wel-being, comfort, and happinesse of the Churches of Christ. These things (without thoughts of provoking any either publike or private person) the searcher of hearts knoweth to be desired and intended by him who is

Thine, to please thee, for thy
good to edification,
GEO. GILLESPIE.

THE CONTENTS.

The first Booke.

Of the Jewish Church Government.

CHAP. I.

That if the Erastians could prove what they alledge concerning the Iewish Church Government, yet in that particular the Jewish Church could not be a president to the Christian.

THe Jewish Church a patterne to us in such things as were not typicall or temporall. If it could be proved, that the Jewes had no supreme Sanhedrin but one, and it such as had the power of civill Magistracy, yet there are foure reasons for which that could be no president to the Christian Church. Where the constitution, manner of proceedings, and power of the Sanhedrin, are touched. Of their *Synagoga Magna*, what it was. That the Priests had great power and authority not onely in occasionall Synods, but in the civill Sanhedrin it selfe.

CHAP.

Chap. II.

That the Jewish Church was formally distinct from the Jewish State or Commonwealth.

WE are content that the Erastians appeale to the Jewish government. Seven distinctions between the Jewish Church and the Jewish State. Of the proselytes of righteousnesse, and that they were imbodied into the Jewish Church, not into the Jewish State.

Chap. III.

That the Jewes had an ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin and Government distinct from the civill.

DIvers Authors cited for the ecclesiastcal Sanhedrin of the Jews. The first Institution thereof, *Exo.* 24. That the chooſing & calling forth of these 70 Elders is not coincident with the chooſing of the 70 Elders mentioned *Num.* 11. nor yet with the chooſing of Judges *Exod.* 18. The institution of two coordinate Governments, cleared from *Deut.* 17. A distinct Ecclesiasticall government setled by *David*, 1 *Chro.* 23. and 26. The same distinction of Civill and Church-government revived by *Jehoshaphat*, 2 *Chro.* 19. That Text vindicated. Two distinct Courts, one Ecclesiasticall, another Civill, proved from *Jerem.* 26. Another argument for an Ecclesiasticall Senate from *Ierem.* 18. 18. Who meant by the wise men of the Jewes? Another argument from *Ezech.* 7. 26. Another from 2 *Kings* 6. 32. and *Ezech.* 8. 1. Another from *Psal.* 107. 32. Another from *Zech.* 7. 1, 2, 3. That *Ezech.* 13. 9.

13.9. seemeth to hold forth an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin. That the Councell of the chiefe Priests, Elders and Scribes, so often mentioned in the Gospel, and in the Acts of the Apostles, was an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, and not a civill Court of Justice, as *Erastus* and M. *Prynne* suppose: which is at length proved. That the civill Sanhedrin which had power of life and death did remove from *Hierusalem*, 40 yeeres before the destruction of the Temple and City, and consequently neere three yeeres before the death of Christ. The great objection, that neither the Talmud nor Talmudicall Writers doe distinguish a civill and an ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, answered. Finally, those who are not convinced that there was a distinct ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jewes, may yet by other *Mediums* be convinced that there was a distinct ecclesiasticall Government among the Jewes: as namely, the Priests judgement of cleanesse or uncleannesse, and so of admitting or shutting out.

CHAP. IV.

That there was an Ecclesiasticall Excommunication among the Jewes: and what it was.

Fifteen witnesses brought for the Ecclesiasticall excommunication among the Jewes, all of them learned in the Jewish antiquities. Of the 24 causes of the Jewish excommunication, which were lookt upon formally *qua* scandals, not *qua* injuries. Of the three degrees of their excommunication, *Niddui*, *Cherem*, and *Shammata*. The manner and form of their Excommunication, sheweth that it was a solemne

Eccleſiaſticall cenſure. *Formula anathematis.* The excommunication of the *Cuthites.* The excommunication among the Jewes was a publique and judicial act: and that a private or extrajudicial excommunication was voyd, if not ratified by the Court. The effects of the Jewiſh excommunication. That
// ſuch as were excommunicated by the greater excommunication were not admitted to come to the Temple. He that was excommunicated with the
// leſſer excommunication was permitted to come, yet not as other Iſraelites, but as one publiquely bearing his ſhame. The end of their excommunication was ſpirituall.

CHAP. V.

Of the cutting of from among the people off God frequently mentioned in the Law.

THe ſence of the Hebrew word כָּרַת ſcanned. That the commination of cutting off a man from his people, or from the Congregation of *Iſrael*, is neither meant of eternall death, nor of dying without children, nor of capitall puniſhment from the hand of the Magiſtrate, nor yet of cutting off by the immediate hand of God for ſome ſecret ſinne. Reaſons brought againſt all theſe. That Excommunication was meant by that cutting off, proved by ſix reaſons.

CHAP. VI.

Of the caſting out of the Synagogue.

THe caſting out of the Synagogue is underſtood by Interpreters and others to be an excommunication

cation from the Church assemblies, and not a civill punishment. Eight considerations to prove this. That he who was cast out of the Synagogue was shut out, not onely from the company and fellowship of men, but from the place of publique sacred assemblies. It cannot be proved, that he who was cast out of the Synagogue was free to enter into the Temple. The casting out of the Synagogue was abused by the Pharisees, as the casting out of the Church by *Diotrephes*.

CHAP. VII.

Other Scripturall arguments to prove an Excommunication in the Iewish Church.

THat the separation from the Congregation, *Ezra* 10.8. was Excommunication. *Iosephus* explained in this particular. Of the devoting of a mans substance as holy to the Lord, which was joyned with the Excommunication. What meant by the cursing *Neh.*13.25. That the ἀφορισμὸς or separating mentioned *Luke* 6.22. was Excommunication, or a segregation not from civil fellowship onely, but from sacred or Church communion. The Ecclesiasticall use of that word touched.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Jewish Exomologesis, or publike Declaration of Repentance by confession of sinne.

THe Heathens had their publique Declaration of repentance from the Jewes. The Jewish Exomologesis proved from the imposition of hands upon

the head of the Sacrifice. The Law *Lev.* 5.5. did also appoint Confession of sinne, to be made at the offering of a Trespasse offering. Which confession was made in the Temple, and in the Priests hearing. The Law of confessing sinne *Num.*5,6,7. explained, and divers particulars concerning confession deduced from it. Other proofes of the Jewish Confession of sins from *Ioh.*9.24. Also from that which interveened between their Excommunication and their absolution. From *Ezra* 10 10,11. That *Davids* confession *Psalm* 51. was published in the Temple, after ministeriall conviction by *Nathan.* That if there be necessity of satisfying an offended brother, how much more of satisfying an offended Church?

CHAP. IX.

Whether in the Iewish Church there was any suspension or exclusion of prophane, scandalous, notorious sinners, from partaking in the publique Ordinances, with the rest of the children of Israel in the Temple.

THe affirmative is proved by plaine and full testimonies of *Philo*, and *Iosephus*, beside some late Writers wel acquainted with the Jewish antiquities. That the Publican *Luke* 18. came not into the Court of *Israel*, but into the Court of the Gentiles. Nor can it be proved, that he was a prophane Publican, so much as in the opinion of the Pharisees and Jews. That the Temple into which the adultresse was brought *John* 8. was also the Court of the Gentiles: neither was she admitted into the Temple for worship, but brought thither for a publique triall and sentence. Seven Scripturall arguments brought to

prove

prove an excluſion of the ſcandalous and known prophane perſons, from the Temple. Somewhat *de jure Zelotarum.* What eſteem the Hebrews had of an Hereticall or Epicurean Iſraelite. That the Temple of *Jeruſalem* was a Type of Chriſt, (which is inſtanced in ten particulars) and had a Sacramentall holineſſe in it, ſo that the analogy is not to be drawn to an excluſion of prophane perſons from the Word preached, but from the Sacrament.

CAHP. X.

A debate with M. Prynne, *concerning the excluſion of prophane ſcandalous perſons from the Paſſeover.*

THe Analogy of the Law of the Paſſeover, as Maſter *Prynne* underſtandeth it, wil militat ſtrongly againſt that which himſelfe yeeldeth. That the uncleane might be kept backe from the Paſſeover longer then a moneth. That they were kept back by an authoritative reſtraint, and were cut off if they did eate in their uncleanneſſe. That ſome uncleane perſons were not put out of the campe, nor from the company of men, but from the Tabernacle and holy things onely. That all uncleane perſons were not ſuſpended from all Ordinances. That ſcandalous and flagitious perſons were not admitted to a treſpaſſe offering (which was a reconciling Ordinance) much leſſe to the Paſſeover (which was a ſealing Ordinance) without a publique penitentiall Confeſſion of their ſinne. M. *Prynnes* replyes to this argument of mine confuted.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

A Confutation of the ſtrongeſt arguments of Eraſtus, *namely, thoſe drawn from the Law of* Moſes.

THe ſtrength of theſe Arguments put together. Which is not onely enervated, but retorted. That the confeſſion of ſinne required *Levit.*5.5. *Num.*5.6,7. was a confeſſion of the particular ſin by word of mouth: and that this confeſſion was required even in criminall and capitall caſes. That morall, as well as ceremoniall uncleanneſſe, was a cauſe of ſequeſtration from the Sanctuary, yea much more, the morall uncleanneſſe being more hatefull to God, more hurtfull and infective to Gods people. That the excluſion of the unclean under the Law could not ſo fitly ſignifie the excluſion from the Kingdom of Heaven, as from communion with the Church in this life. That this legall Type did certainly ſignifie a ſequeſtration of ſcandalous or morally uncleane perſons from Church-Communion under the New Teſtament, is proved from *Eſay* 52.1. 2 *Cor.*6.14,15,16, 17. alſo from the expoſition of *Peters* viſion *Acts* 10. That among the Jewes ſuch as attended a litigious action, or at leaſt a capitall judgement, upon the preparation day, were thought defiled and not allowed to eate the Paſſeover. That it was not left to a mans free will to judge of his owne cleanneſſe or uncleanneſſe, nor to expiate his ſinne when he pleaſed. That the univerſall precept for all that were circumciſed to eate the Paſſeover, doth admit of other exceptions, beſide thoſe that were legally uncleane, or in a journey. The great difference between

Sacra-

Sacraments and *Sacrifices*, which *Erastus* confoundeth.

CHAP. XII.

Fourteen arguments to prove that scandalous and presumptuous offenders against the morall Law, (though circumcised, and not being legally uncleane) were excluded from the Passeover.

KNown presumptuous and obstinate sinners, were cut off from among their people, therefore not admitted to the Passeover. The Jewes themselves held that morall, as wel as ceremoniall uncleanesse did render them incapable of eating the Passeover. Who were esteemed Hereticall or apostat Israelites? Who Epicurean Israelites? That these and such like were not acknowledged to be in the communion of the Church of *Israel*, nor was it allowed to speake or converse with them, muchlesse that they should eate the Passeover. *Grotius* his argument, there was an excommunication for ceremoniall uncleanesse, therefore much more for morall uncleanesse. What God did teach his people by the purging out of leaven. If the shew-bread might not be given to *Davids* men, unlesse they had for some space before abstained from their wives, much lesse might known adulterers be admitted to the Passeover. *Ezech.* 22. 26. discussed against Mr. *Coleman*. The originall words explained. Prophane Church members have the name of Heathens, and strangers. The qualifications of Proselytes, without which they were not admitted to Circumcision and the Passeover. That course was taken. *Ezra* 10. that none defiled

with unlawfull marriages might eate the Passeover. By *Erastus* his principles the most scandalous conversation was not so hatefull to God as legall uncleanesse. The Law of confessing sin, *Levit.* 5. *Num.* 5. is meant of every known sin, which was to be expiated by Sacrifice, especially the more notorious and scandalous sins.

CHAP. XIII.

M. Prynnes *argument from* 1 Cor. 10. *(which he takes to be unanswerable) discussed and confuted.*

Mr *Prynne* in expounding that Text of the Passeover differeth both from the Apostles, and from *Erastus* himselfe. His argument (if good) wil necessarily conclude against his owne Concessions. If scandalous sinners had been suspended from the Manna, and Water of the Rocke, they had been suspended from their ordinary orporal meat and drinke. That the scandalous sins mentioned by the Apostle, were committed, not before, but after their eating of that Spirituall meate, and drinking of that Spirituall drinke. The Argument strongly retorted. The scandalous sins mentioned by the Apostle were Nationall sins, and so come not home to the present Question, which is of persons, not of Nations.

An Appendix to the first Booke.

THe Erastians misrepresent the Jewish Government. Their complyance with the Anabaptists in this particular. Their confounding of that which

was

was extraordinary in the Jewish Church, with that which was the ordinary rule. Fourteen Objections answered. M. *Prynne* his great mistakes of *Deut.* 17. and 2 *Chron.* 19. The power and practice of the godly Kings of *Judah* in the reformation of Religion cleared. The Argument from *Solomon* his deposing of *Abiathar*, and putting *Zadock* in his place, answered foure waies. The Priests were appointed to be as Judges in other cases, beside those of *leprosie* and *jealousie*. 2 *Chro.* 23. 19. further scanned. A scandalous person was an unclean person both in the Scripture phrase, and in the Jewish language. The sequestration of the uncleane from the Sanctuary, no civill punishment. Of Lawes and causes Civill and Ecclesiasticall among the Jewes. Of their Scribes and Lawyers. Some other observable passages of *Maimonides* concerning Excommunication. What meant by *not entring into the Congregation of the Lord*, *Deut.* 23. 1, 2, 3. and by *separating the mixed multitude*, *Nehem.* 13. 2. Five reasons to prove that the meaning of these places, is not in reference to civil dignities and places of government, nor yet in reference to unlawful mariages onely, but in reference to Church-membership and communion. Two Objections to the contrary answered. One from *Exod.* 12. 48. Another from the example of *Ruth*. An useful observation out of *Onkelos*, Exod. 12.

The second Booke.

Of the Christian Church Government.

Chap. I.

Of the rise, growth, decay and reviving of Erastianisme.

The Erastian error not *honestis parentibus natus*. *Erastus* the *Mid-wife*, how engaged in the busines. The breasts that gave it sucke, *prophanesse* and *self-interest*. Its strong food, arbitrary Government. Its Tutor, Arminianisme. Its deadly decay and consumption, whence it was? How ill it hath been harboured in all the reformed Churches? How stiffled by *Erastus* himselfe? Erastianisme confuted out of *Erastus*. The Divines who have appeared against this error. How the Controversie was lately revived?

Chap. II.

Some Postulata *or common principles to be presupposed.*

That there ought to be an exclusion of vile and prophane persons, (knowne to be such) from the holy things, is a principle received among the Heathens themselves. That the dishonour of God by scandalous sinnes ought to be punished, as well, yea much rather, than private injuries. That publique sinnes ought to be publiquely confessed, and the offenders

fenders put to publique ſhame. That there ought to be an avoyding of, and withdrawing from ſcandalous perſons in the Church, and that by a publique order, rather then at every mans diſcretion. That there is a diſtinction of the Office and power of *Magiſtracy* a d *Miniſtery*. That the directive judgement in any buſineſſe doth chiefly belong to thoſe who by their profeſſion and vocation are ſet apart to the attendance and overſight of ſuch a thing.

Chap. III.

What the Eraſtians yeeld unto us, and what we yeeld unto them?

They yeeld that the Magiſtrate his power *in Eccleſiaſticis*, is not arbitrary, but tied to the word. That there may be a diſtinct Church government under Heathen Magiſtrates. That the abuſe takes not away the juſt power. They allow of Presbyteries, and that they have ſome juriſdiction. That the Miniſtery is *Jure divino*, and Magiſtracy diſtinct from it. We yeeld unto them, That none ought to be Rulers in the Church, but ſuch againſt whom there is no juſt exception. That Presbyteriall government is not a *Dominion* but a *Service*. That it hath for its object onely the inward man. That Preſbyteriall government is not an Arbitrary government, cleared by five conſiderations. That it is the moſt limited, and leaſt Arbitrary government of any other, cleared by comparing it with *Popery*, *Prelacy*, *Independency*, and with lawfull *Magiſtracy*. That the civil Magiſtrate may and ought to doe much in and for Religion, ordinarily, and yet more in extraordi-

nary cases. That the civil Sanction is a free and voluntary act of the Magistrates favour. That Ministers owe as much subjection and honour to the Magistrate as other Subjects.

CHAP. IV.

Of the agreement and the differences between the nature of the Civill, and of the Ecclesiasticall powers or Governments.

TEn agreements between the Civil power and the Ecclesiasticall power. The differences between them opened in their causes, efficient, matter, (where a fourfold power of the keys is touched) forme, and ends, both supreme and subordinate, (where it is opened, how and in what respect the Christian Magistrate intendeth the glory of Jesus Christ, and the purging of his Church;) Also effects, objects, adjuncts, correlations, ultimate terminations, and divided executions.

CHAP. V.

Of a twofold Kingdome of Jesus Christ: a generall Kingdome as he is the eternall Sonne of God, the Head of all Principalities and Powers, raigning over all creatures: and a particular Kingdome, as he is Mediator, raigning over the Church onely.

HOw this controversie fals in, and how deepe it drawes. That our Opposites herein joyne issue with the Socinians. Nine Arguments to prove this distinction of a twofold Kingdom of Christ. In which, of the eternity, universality, donation, and subordination.

dination of the Kingdome of Christ. The Arguments brought to prove that Christ as Mediator raigneth over all things, and hath all government (even civil) put in his hands, examined and confuted. In what sence Christ is said to be *over all, the heire of all things*, to have *all things put under his feet*, to be *the head of every man.* A distinction between Christs *Kingdome, Power, and Glory*, cleared.

Chap. VI.

Whether Jesus Christ, as Mediator, and Head of the Church, hath placed the Christian Magistrate, to hold and execute his office, under and for him as his Vicegerent? The Arguments for the affirmative discussed.

The decision of this Question will doe much, (yet not all) in the decision of the Erastian controversie. The question rightly stated. Ten Arguments for the affirmative discussed and answered. Where divers Scriptures are debated and cleared. How we are to understand that Christ is *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* How *all power in Heaven and in Earth* is said to be *given to him.* That the *Governments* set in the Church, 1 *Cor.*12.28. are not civill Magistrates, fully proved, *Ephes.* 1. 21, 22, 23. and *Colos.* 2. 10. vindicated.

Chap. VII.

Arguments for the negative of that Question formerly propounded.

The lawfull authority of the Heathen Magistrates vindicated. It can not be shewed from Scripture, that

that Christ as Mediator hath given any Commission of Vice-gerentship to the Christian Magistrate. That the worke of the Ministery is done in the name and authority of Jesus Christ: the worke of Magistracy not so. The power of Magistracy or civill Government, was not given to Christ as Mediator, shewed from *Luke* 12.14. *John* 18 36. *Luke* 17 20,21. Magistracy founded in the Law of nature and Nations. The Scripture holds forth the same origination of Heathen Magistracy, and of Christian Magistracy.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the power and privilege of the Magistrate in things and causes Ecclesiasticall, what it is not, and what it is?

THat no administration formally and properly Ecclesiasticall, (and namely the dispencing of Church censures) doth belong unto the Magistrate, nor may (according to the Word of God) be assumed and exercised by him, proved by six Arguments. That Christ hath not made the Magistrate head of the Church, to receive appeales from all Ecclesiasticall Assembles. There are other sufficient remedies against abuses or Mal-administration in Church-Government Reasons against such appeales to the Magistrate. The Arguments to the contrary from the Examples of *Jeremy* and of *Paul*, discussed. Of the collaterality and coordination of the Civill and Ecclesiasticall powers. What is the power and right of the Magistrate in things and causes Ecclesiasticall, cleared first generally; next, more particularly by five distinctions. 1. τὰ ἐξωτὴς ἐκκλησίας belong to the civill

civill power, but not πὰ ἔσω. 2. The Magistrate may *imperare* that which he may not *elicere*. 3. Distinguish the *directive* power from the *coercive* power. 4. The Magistrates power is *cumulative* not *privative*. 5. He may doe in extraordinary cases that which he ought not to doe ordinarily. A caution concerning the Arbitrary power of Magistrates in things Ecclesiasticall.

CHAP. IX.

That by the Word of God there ought to be another Government besides Magistracy or civill Government, namely an Ecclesiasticall Government (properly so called) in the hands of Church-officers.

The Question stated, and the Affirmative proved by one and twenty Scripturall Arguments. Who meant by *the Elders that rule well*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. προεστῶς and προϊστάμενοι names of government. The words ἡγέμενοι and πείθεσθε *Heb* 13 7,17. examined. Of receiving an accusation against an Elder. Of rejecting an Hereticke. Of the excommunication of the Incestuous *Corinthian*, and the sence of the word ἐπιπλία. Of the subjection of the spirits of the Prophets to the Prophets. The Angels of the Churches why reproved for having false Teachers in the Church? *Note that man*, 2 *Thess.* 3.14. proved to be Church-censure. Of the *Ruler*, *Rom.* 12.8. and *Governments*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. A patterne in the Jewish Church for a distinct Ecclesiasticall government. What meant by cutting off, *Gal.* 5. 12? ἀποκόπτω properly what? Of the Ministeriall power *to revenge all disobedience*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. ἐκδικῆσαι 2 *Cor.* 2.8. what? Of the

the visible administration of the Kingdome of Christ by his Laws, Courts, Censures. The Arguments for Excommunication, from *Matth.* 18. and 1 *Cor.* 5. briefly vindicated. That Elders are rulers of the flock. ἐπίσκοπος a name of Government. Ministers why called *Stewards of the Mysteries of God.* Οἰκονόμος a name of government. Church-Government exercised by the Synod of the Apostles and Elders, *Acts* 15.

CHAP. X.

Some objections made against Ecclesiasticall Government and Discipline, answered.

Mr *Hussey's* objection doth stricke as much against *Paul*, as against us. The fallacy of comparing Government with the word preached, in point of efficacy. Foure ends or uses of Church-government. That two coordinate Governments are not inconsistent. The objection, that Ministers have other worke to doe, answered. The feare of an ambitious ensnarement in the Ministery, so much objected, is no good Argument against Church-government. M. *Hussey's* motion concerning Schooles of Divinity examined. Church Government is no immunity to Church-officers from Censure. Though the Erastian principles are sufficiently overthrown by asserting from Scripture the *may be* of Church-government, yet our Arguments prove a *must be* or an Institution. Six Arguments added which conclude this point.

Chap. XI.

The necessity of a distinct Church-government, under Christian, as well as under Heathen Magistrates.

THis acknowledged by Christian Emperours of old. *Grotius* for us in this particular. Christian Magistracy hath never yet punished all such offences as are Ecclesiastically censurable. Presbyteries in the primitive times did not exercise any power which did belong of right to the Magistrate. No warrant from the word, that the Ordinance of a distinct Church government, was onely for Churches under persecution: but contrariwise the Churches are charged to keep till the comming of Christ, the commandement then delivered. No just ground for the feare of the interfeering of the civill, and of the Ecclesiasticall power. The Churches liberties enlarged, (not diminished) under Christian Magistrats. The Covenant against this exception of the Erastians. The Christian Magistrate, if he should take upon him the whole burthen of the corrective part of Church-government, could not give an account to God of it. The Erastian principles doe involve the Magistrate into the Prelaticall guiltinesse. The reasons and grounds mentioned in Scripture, upon which Church-censures were dispenced in the Primitive Churches, are no other then concerne the Churches under Christian Magistrates. The end of Church-censures, neither intended nor attained by the administration of Christian Magistracy. The power of binding and loosing not temporary. They who restrict a distinct Church-government, to

Churches under Heathen or perſecuting Magiſtrats, give a mighty advantage to Socinians and Anabaptiſts. *Gualther* and Maſter *Prynne* for us in this Queſtion.

APPENDIX.

A Collection of ſome teſtimonies out of a Declaration of King *James*, the *Helvetian*, *Bohemian*, *Auguſtane*, *French*, and *Dutch* confeſſions, the Eccleſiaſticall Diſcipline of the reformed Churches in *France*, *Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum*, the Iriſh Articles, a Book of *Melanchton*, and another of *L. Humfredus*.

The third Booke.

Of Excommunication from the Church, AND Of Suſpenſion from the Lords Table.

CHAP. I.

An opening of the true ſtate of the queſtion, and of Maſter Prynnes *many miſtakes and miſ-repreſentations of our Principles.*

A Tranſition from Church-government in generall, to Excommunication and Suſpenſion in particular. The preſent controverſie ten waies miſ-ſtated by M. *Prynne*. That which was publiquely depending

pending between the Parliament and Assembly, did rather concerne the practicall conclusion it selfe, then the *Mediums* to prove it. The strength of the Assemblies proofes for Suspension scarce touched by M. *Prynne*. That the power of Suspension is neither in the Minister alone, nor unlimitted. The question is practically stated by *Aretius*. The present controversie how different from the Prelaticall? The power desired to Elderships, is not to judge mens hearts, but to judge of externall evidences. The distinction of converting and confirming Ordinances how necessary in this question? Excommunication and Suspension confounded by M. *Prynne* (as likewise by the Separatists) contrary to the manner both of the Jewish Church, and of the ancient and reformed Christian Churches. M. *Prynnes* assertion concerning suspension, is contrary to the Ordinances of Parliament. The Question stated, as it ought to be stated.

CHAP. II.

Whether Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17. *prove Excommunication.*

THe Erastians cannot avoyd an argument *ex consequenti* from this Text for Excommunication, although we should grant that the literall sence and direct intendment of the words, is not concerning Excommunication. Of the word ἐκκλησία. That the trespasse meant vers. 15. is sometime known to more then one at first. That the meaning is not of a civill personall injury, but of a scandalous sinne, whether there be materially a personall injury in it or not.

This confirmed by six reasons. That if it were granted these words, *If thy brother trespasse against thee*, are understood of a personall injury, this could be no advantage to the Erastian cause, in six respects. *Erastus* his Argument, that the trespasse here meant is such as one brother may forgive to another, answered. That the Law of two or three witnesses belongeth to Ecclesiasticall, as well as to civill Courts. That *Tell the Church* here can not be, Tell the civill Sanhedrin or Court of justice among the Jewes. Of the meaning of these words *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican.* M. *Prynnes* Argument retorted. That the Heathens might not enter into the Temple, to wit, into the Court of *Israel*, but into the *Intermurale* they might come and worship. That there is not the like reason for excluding Excommunicate persons wholly from our Churches. Of *Solomons* porch. That M. *Prynne* confoundeth the devout penitent Publican with the prophane unjust Publicans. The Objection from the Publicans going up to the Temple to pray, examined. Publicans commonly named as the worst and wickedest of men. Another objection, *Let him be to thee*, (not to the whole Church) *as an Heathen, &c.* discussed.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

A further demonstration that these words, Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican, *are not meant of avoyding Civill, but Religious or Church-fellowship.*

THe great disorder and confusion which M. *Prynne* his sence of this Text might introduce. That it was not unlawfull to the Jewes to have civill company or fellowship with Heathens, unlesse it were for religious respects, and in case of the danger of an idolatrous insnarement, which is cleared by a passage of *Elias in Thesbyte.* In what sence *Peter* saith *Acts* 10. 28. that a Jew might not keepe company or come unto one of another Nation. That the Jewes did keep civill and familiar fellowship with *Ger toschav*, or *Ger schagnar*, the proselyte induelier, or the proselyte of the gate, who yet was uncircumcised, and no member of the Jewish Church, nor an observer of the Law of *Moses*, but onely of the seven precepts given to the sonnes of *Noah.* Which cleareth the reason why the Synod of the Apostles and Elders, who would not impose circumcision nor any other of the Mosaicall ceremonies upon the believing Gentiles, did nevertheless impose this as a necessary burthen upon them, to abstaine from blood and things strangled. Christians are permitted by *Paul* to eate and drinke with them that believe not. Further proofes that some uncircumcised Heathens had civill fellowship with the Jewes, and some circumcised Hebrews had not Ecclesiasticall communion with the Jewes. The Question decided out of *Maimonides.* That these words, *Let him be unto*

thee

thee as an Heathen man and a Publican doe imply somewhat negative, and somewhat positive. The negative part is, that he must not be worse used in civill things, than an Heathen man or Publican: that Excommunication breaketh not naturall and morall duties: neither is any civill fellowship at all forbidden to be kept with an Excommunicate person, except under a spirituall notion and for spirituall ends, not *qua* civill fellowship. The positive part is, that he must be used in the same manner, as an Heathen man and a Publican in Spirituall things, and in Church-communion. Heathens five waies excluded from communion with the Jewes in the holy things. *Let him be as a Publican* implieth two things more then *Let him be as an Heathen*, but exclusion from some Ordinances was common both to Heathens and scandalous Publicans. That the Pharisees speech concerning the Publican who went up to the Temple to pray, sheweth that he was not esteemed a prophane Publican.

CHAP. IV.

A Confutation of Erastus *and* Bilson *their Interpretation of* Matth. 18.15,16,17. *as likewise of Dr.* Sutcliffe *his Glosse, differing somewhat from theirs.*

THe scope of this Scripture wholly spirituall, concerning the gaining of a brother from sin, not civill concerning the prosecuting of a personall injury. Rebuke for sinne a common Christian duty. Which is necessary in sinnes committed against God, rather than in injuries committed against man. That any sinne by which thou art scandalized is a trespasse

against

againſt thee. The Eraſtian Interpretation of *Matth.* 18. makes it lawfull for one Chriſtian to goe to law with another before an unbelieving Judge, and ſo maketh *Paul* contrary to Chriſt. The ſame Interpretation reſtricteth the latter part of the Text to thoſe Chriſtians onely, who live under an unbelieving Magiſtrate, while it is confeſſed that the former part belongeth to all Chriſtians. It is contrary alſo to the Law of *Moyſes.* They contradict themſelves concerning the coercive power of the Sanhedrin. The gradation in the Text inconſiſtent with their ſence. The Argument of *Eraſtus* to prove that the words *as a Publican,* are meant of a Publican *qua* Publican, and ſo of every Publican, examined. Their exception, *Let him be TO THEE, &c.* not to the whole Church, anſwered three waies.

CHAP. V.

That Tell it unto the Church *hath more in it, then,* Tell it unto a greater number.

THe word ἐκκλησία never given to any lawfull aſſembly, ſimply becauſe of majority of number. This Interpretation provideth no effectuall remedy for offences. *Kahal* by the Hebrews and ἐκκλησία by the Grecians often uſed for an aſſembly of ſuch as had Juriſdiction and ruling power. Whether the two or three witneſſes *Matth.* 18.16. be onely witneſſes or aſſiſtants in the admonition, or whether the intention be that they ſhall prove the fact before the Church forenſically, (if need be) and whether two or three witneſſes muſt be taken when the offence is known to him onely that gives the firſt rebuke;

diſ-

discussed? This their Interpretation brings a brother under the greatest yoke of bondage. *Grotius* his Interpretation of the word *Church*, not inconsistent with ours. Divers Authors of the best note for our Interpretation, that is, that by the Church here is meant the Elders of the Church assembled. The name of the Church given to the Elders for four considerations.

Chap. VI.

Of the power of binding and loosing, Matth. 18.18.

OUr Opposites extreamly difficulted and divided in this point. Binding and loosing both among Hebrews & Grecians, authoritative & forensicall words. Antiquity for us, which is proved out of *Augustine*, *Hierome*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostome*, *Isidorus Pelusiota*, *Hilary*, *Theophylact*. That this power of binding and loosing belongeth neither to private persons, nor to civill Magistrates, but to Church officers, and that in reference, 1. to the bonds of sinne and iniquity. 2. To the dogmaticall decision of controversies concerning the will of Christ. That this power of binding and loosing is not meerely doctrinall but juridicall or forensicall, and meant of inflicting or taking off Ecclesiasticall censure. This cleared by the coherence and dependency between verse 17. and 18, (which is asserted against M. *Prynne*) and further confirmed by eleven reasons. In which the agreement of two on earth verse 19. the restriction of the rule to a brother or Church-member, also *Matth.* 16.19. *Iohn* 20.23. *Psalm* 149.6,7,8,9. are explained. Another Interpretation of the binding and loosing, that it

is

is not exercised about persons, but about things or Doctrines, confuted by five reasons. How binding and loosing are acts of the power of the Keys, as well as shutting and opening.

CHAP. VII.

That 1 Cor. 5. *proveth Excommunication, and (by a necessary consequence even from the Erastian Interpretation) Suspension from the Sacrament of a person un excommunicated.*

THe weight of our proofs not laid upon the phrase of delivering to Sathan. Which phrase being set aside that Chapter will prove Excommunication, verse 8. *Let us keepe the Passeover &c.* applied to the Lords Supper, even by M. *Prynne* himselfe. Master *Prynnes* first exception from 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. & 11. 20 21. concerning the admission of all the visible members of the Church of *Corinth*, even drunken persons to the Sacrament, answered. His second, a reflection upon the persons of men. His third, concerning these words, *No, not to eate*, confuted. Hence Suspension by necessary consequence. His fourth exception taken off. His three conditions which he requireth in Arguments from the lesser to the greater, are false and doe not hold. Our Argument from this Text doth not touch upon the rock of separation. Eight considerations to prove an Ecclesiasticall censure, and namely excommunication from 1 *Cor.* 5. compared with 2 *Cor.* 2. More of that phrase, *to deliver such a one to Sathan.*

Chap. VIII.

Whether Judas *received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.*

THe Queſtion between M. *Prynne* & me concerning *Judas*, much like unto that between Papiſts and Proteſtants concerning *Peter*. Two things premiſed. 1. That *Matthew* and *Marke* mentioning Chriſts diſcourſe at Table, concerning the Traytor, before the Inſtitution and diſtribution of the Lords Supper, place it in its proper order, and that *Luke* placeth it after the Sacrament by an ὑπερολογία or recapitulation: which is proved by five reaſons. 2. That the ſtory *John* 13. concerning *Judas* and the ſop, was neither acted in *Bethany* two daies before the Paſſeover, nor yet after the Inſtitution of the Lords Supper. The firſt Argument to prove that *Judas* received not the Lords Supper from *Joh.* 13. 30. *he went out immediately after the ſop.* Mr *Prynnes* foure anſwers confuted. His opinion that Chriſt gave the Sacrament before the common ſupper, is againſt both Scripture and Antiquity. Of the word *immediately.* The ſecond Argument from Chriſts words at the Sacrament. That which M. *Prynne* holds, *viz.* that at that time (when Chriſt infallibly knew *Judas* to be loſt) he meant conditionally that his body was broken and his blood ſhed for *Judas*; confuted by three reaſons. The third Argument from the different expreſſions of Love to the Apoſtles, with an exception, while *Judas* was preſent; without an exception at the Sacrament. M. *Prynnes* Arguments from Scripture to prove that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament,

ment, answered. That *Judas* received the Sacrament, is no indubitable verity as Mr. *Prynne* cals it, but hath been much controverted both among Fathers, Papists and Protestants. That the *Lutherans* who are much of M. *Prynnes* opinion in the point of *Judas* his receiving of the Lords Supper, that they may the better uphold their Doctrine of the wicked their eating of the true body of Christ, yet are much against his opinion in the point of admitting scandalous persons not Excommunicated to the Sacrament. M. *Prynnes* bold assertion that all the Ancients except *Hilary* onely, doe unanimously accord that *Judas* received the Lords Supper, without one dissenting voyce; disproved as most false, and confuted by the testimonies of *Clemens*, *Dionysius Areopagita*, *Maximus*, *Pachymeres*, *Ammonius Alexandrinus*, *Tacianus*, *Innocentius* 3. *Rupertus Tuitiensis*, yea by those very passages of *Theophylact*, and *Victor Antiochenus*, cited by himselfe. Many moderne writters also against his opinion, as of the Papists, *Salmeron*, *Turrianus*, *Barradius*, of Protestants, *Danæus*, *Kleinwitzius*, *Piscator*, *Beza*, *Tossanus*, *Musculus*, *Zanchius*, *Gomarus*, *Diodati*, *Grotius*. The testimonies cited by M. *Prynne* for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament examined: some of them found false, others prove not his point, others who thinke that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament, are cleare against the admission of known prophane persons. The confession of *Bohemia* and *Belgia* not against us, but against Master *Prynne*.

Chap. IX.

Whether Judas *received the Sacrament of the Passeover that night in which our Lord was betrayed.*

That Christ and his Apostles did eate the Passeover, not before, but after that Supper at which he did wash his Disciples feet, and give the sop to *Judas*. These words *before the Feast of the Passeover*, *Ioh.* 13. 1. scanned. The Jewes did eate the Passeover after meale, but they had no meale after the Paschall supper. δείπνου γενομένου *Ioh.* 13. 2. needeth not be turned, *supper being ended*, but may suffer two other readings. Christs sitting down with the twelve is not meant of the Pasehall supper, and if it were, it proves not that *Judas* did eate of that Passeover, more than 1 *Cor.* 15. 5. proves that *Judas* did see Christ after his resurrection. A pious observation of *Cartwright*. Another of *Chrysostome*.

Chap. X.

That if it could be proved that Judas *received the Lords Supper, it maketh nothing against the Suspension of known wicked persons from the Sacrament.*

Christs admitting of *Judas* to the Sacrament when he knew him to be a divell, could no more be a president to us, then his choosing of *Judas* to be an Apostle, when he knew also that he was a divell. *Judas* his sinne was not scandalous but secret, at that time when it is supposed that he did receive the Sacrament. The same thing which M. *Prynne* makes to have been after the Sacrament, to prove that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament, the very same he makes

makes to have been before the Sacrament, to prove that *Judas* was a scandalous sinner, when he was admitted to the Sacrament. He yeeldeth upon the matter that *Judas* received not the Sacrament. That before *Judas* went forth, none of the Apostles knew him to be the Traytor except *John*, yea some hold that *John* knew it not. That Christs words to *Judas*, *Thou hast said*, did not make known to the Apostles that he was the Traitor, and if they had, yet (by their principles who hold that *Judas* received the Sacrament) these words were not spoken before the Sacrament. Divers Authors hold that *Judas* was a secret, not a scandalous sinner, at that time when it is supposed he received the Sacrament, yea M. *Prynne* himselfe holdeth so in another place. He loseth much by proposing as a president to Ministers what Christ did to *Judas* in the last Supper. Christ did upon the matter excommunicate *Judas*; which many gather from these words, *That thou dost doe quickly*. And if Christ had admitted him to the Sacrament, it could be no president to us.

Chap. XI.

Whether it be a full discharge of duty to admonish a scandalous person of the danger of unworthy communicating? And whether a Minister in giving him the Sacrament after such admonition, be no way guilty?

Mr *Prynne* doth here mistake his marke, or not hit it, whether the Question be stated in reference to the Censure of Suspension, or in reference to the personall duty of the Minister. Five duties of the Minister in this businesse beside Admonition. Admonition

nition no Church censure, properly. Six conclusions premised by M *Prynne*, examined. His Syllogism concerning the true right of all visible members of the visible Church to the Sacrament discussed. Four sorts of persons, beside children and fooles, not able to examine themselves, and so not to be admitted to the Lords Supper, by that limitation which M. *Prynne* yeedeth. His Argument from the admission of carnall persons to Baptisme, upon a meere externall fleight profession, answered. His eleven reasons for the affirmative of this present Question answered. The Erastian Argument from 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man examine himselfe*, not others, nor others him, faileth many waies. M. *Prynne* endeavours to pacifie the consciences of Ministers by perswading them to believe, that a scandalous person is outwardly fitted and prepared for the Sacrament. How dangerous a way it is to give the Sacrament to a scandalous person, upon hopes that Omnipotency can at that instant change his heart and his life. Of a mans eating and drinking judgement to himselfe.

Chap. XII.

Whether the Sacrament of the Lords Supper be a converting or regenerating Ordinance.

Mr *Prynne* in this controversie joyneth not onely with the more rigid *Lutherans*, but with the Papists. The testimonies of *Calvin*, *Bullinger*, *Ursinus*, *Musculus*, *Bucerus*, *Festus Honnius*. *Aretius*, *Vossius*, *Pareus*, the Belgicke confession, and forme of administration, the Synod of *Dort*, *Gerhardus*, *Walæus*, *Chamierus*, *Polanus*, *Amesius*, are produced against

M. *Prynne*, all theſe and many others denying the Lords Supper to be a converting Ordinance. How both *Lutherans* and Papiſts ſtate their controverſie with *Calviniſts* (as they call them) concerning the efficacy of the Sacraments. M. *Prynnes* diſtinctions of two ſorts of converſion, and two ſorts of ſealing, being duely examined, doe but the more open his errour inſtead of covering it. Of the words *Sacrament* and *Seale*: concerning which M. *Prynne* as he leaneth toward the Socinian opinion, ſo he greatly cals in queſtion that truth, without the knowledge whereof the Ordinance of Parliament appointeth men to be kept backe from the Sacrament. Foure diſtinctions of my own premiſed, that the true ſtate of the Queſtion may be rightly apprehended. The 1. Diſtinction between the abſolute power of God, and the revealed will of God. 2. Between the Sacrament it ſelfe, and other Ordinances which doe accompany it. 3. Between the firſt grace, and the following graces. 4. Between viſible Saints and inviſible Saints

CHAP. XIII.

Twenty Arguments to prove that the Lords Supper is not a converting Ordinance.

1. FRom the nature of ſignes inſtituted to ſignifie the being or having of a thing. The ſignificancy of Sacraments à *parte ante*. 2. Sacraments ſuppoſe faith and an intereſt had in Chriſt, therefore doe not give it. 3. The Lords Supper gives the new food, therefore it ſuppoſeth the new life. 4. It is a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith, therefore inſti-

tuted

tuted for justified persons onely. 5. From the example of *Abrahams* Justification before circumcision. 6. From the duty of self-examination, which an unregenerate person cannot performe. 7. From the necessity of the wedding garment. 8. Faith comes by hearing, not by seeing or receiving. 9. Neither promise nor example in Scripture of conversion by the Lords Supper. 10. Every unconverted and unworthy person, if he come (while such) to the Lords Table) cannot but eate and drink unworthily, therefore ought not to come. 11. The wicked have no part in an Eucharisticall consolatory Ordinance. 12. Christ calleth none to this Feast but such as have spirituall gracious qualifications. 13. They that are visibly no Saints, ought not to partake in the Communion of Saints. 14. Baptisme it selfe (at least when administred to persons of age) is not a regenerating, but a sealing Ordinance. 15. From the necessity of the precedency of Baptisme before the Lords Supper. 16. From the method of the Parable of the lost sonne. 17. From the doctrinall dehorting of all impenitent unworthy persons from comming to the Sacrament, unless they repent, reforme, &c. (allowed by M. *Prynne* himselfe) which a Minister may not doe, if it be a converting Ordinance. 18. From the incommunicablenesse of this Ordinance to Pagans, or to excommunicated Christians for their conversion. 19. From the instrumentall causality of a converting Ordinance, which in order doth not follow, but precede conversion, and therefore is administred to men, not *qua* penitent, but *qua* impenitent, which can not be said of the Sacrament. 20. Antiquity against M. *Prynne* in this point. Witnesse the

Sancta

Sancta Sanctis. Witneſſe alſo *Dionyſius Areopagita, Juſtin Martyr, Chryſoſtome, Auguſtine, Iſidorus Peluſiota, Proſper, Beda, Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis, Rabanus Maurus,* beſides *Scotus, Alenſis,* and other Schoolmen.

CHAP. XIV.

Maſter Prynne *his twelve Arguments brought to prove that the Lords Supper is a converting Ordinance, diſcuſſed and anſwered.*

His firſt Argument anſwered by three diſtinctions. His ſecond proveth nothing againſt us, but yeeldeth ſomewhat which is for us. His third charged with divers abſurdities. His fourth concerning the greateſt proximity and moſt immediate preſence of God, and of Chriſt in the Sacrament retorted againſt himſelfe, and moreover not proved nor made good by him. His fifth Argument hath both univerſall grace and other abſurdities in it. His ſixth concerning converſion by the eye, by the booke of nature, by Sacrifices, by Miracles, as well as by the eare, examined and confuted in the particulars. His ſeventh not proved. Nor yet his eighth, concerning converſion by afflictions without the word. His ninth concerning the rule of contraries is miſapplied by him. His tenth concerning the ends of the Sacrament yeeldeth the cauſe and mireth himſelfe. His eleventh a groſſe *petitio principii.* His twelfth appealing to the experience of Chriſtians, rectified in the ſtate, and repelled for the weight. That this debate concerning the nature, end, uſe, and effect of the Sacrament, doth clearely caſt the ballance of the wholecontroverſie concerning Suſpenſion. *Lucas*

Ostander cited by M. *Prynne* against us, is more against himselfe.

CHAP. XV.

Whether the admission of scandalous and notorious sinners to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, be a pollution and prophanation of that holy Ordinance? And in what respects it may be so called?

The true state of this Question cleared by five distinctions. Nine Arguments to prove the affirmative. That the admitting of the scandalous and prophane to the Sacrament gives the lie to the word preached, and looseth those whom the word bindeth. That it is a strengthning of the hands of the wicked. Tis a prophanation of Baptisme to baptise a Catechumene Jew, or a Pagan, being of a known prophane life, although he were able to make confession of the true faith by word of mouth. That such as are found unable to examine themselves (whether through naturall or sinfull disability) or manifestly unwilling to it, ought not to be admitted to the Lords Supper. The reason for keeping backe children and fooles holds stronger for keeping back known prophane persons. *Hag.* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14. explained. A debate upon *Matth.* 7. 6 *Give not that which is holy to dogs, &c* wherein M. *Prynne* is confuted from Scripture, from Antiquity, from *Erastus* also and *Grotius*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

An Argument of Erastus *(drawn from the Baptisme of* John*) against the excluding of scandalous sinners from the Lords Supper, examined.*

THat *John* baptised none but such as confessed their sinnes, and did outwardly appeare penitent. Tis a great question whether those Pharisees who came to his Baptisme, *Matth.* 3. were baptised. The coincidency of that story *Matth.* 3. with the message of the Pharisees to *John* Baptist, *Ioh.* 1. The Argument retorted.

CHAP. XVII.

Antiquity for the Suspension of all scandalous persons from the Sacrament, even such as were admitted to other publique Ordinances.

OF the foure degrees of Penitents in the ancient Church, and of the Suspension of some unexcommunicated persons from the Lords Supper who did joyn with the Church in the hearing of the word and prayer. Proved out of the ancient Canons of the Councels of *Ancyra*, *Nice*, *Arles*, the sixth and eighth Generall Councels, out of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, and *Basilius Magnus*, confirmed also out of *Zonaras*, *Balsamon*, *Albaspinaeus*. The Suspension of all sorts of scandalous sinners in the Church from the Sacrament further confirmed out of *Isidorus Peluseota*, *Dionysius Areopagita* with his Scholiast *Maximus*, and his paraphrast *Pachimeres*. Also out of *Cyprian*, *Justin Martyr*, *Chrysostome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Gregorius Magnus*, *Walafridus Strabo*.

Chap. XVIII.

A discovery of the instability and looseneſſe of M. Prynne *his principles, even to the contradicting of himſelfe in twelve particulars.*

AN Argument hinted by M. *Prynne* from the gathering together all gueſts to the wedding Supper, both bad and good, examined, and foure anſwers made to it. That M. *Prynne* doth profeſſe and pretend to yeeld the thing for which his Antagoniſts contend with him, but indeed doth not yeeld it: his Conceſſions being clogged with ſuch things as do evacuate and fruſtrate all Church Diſcipline. That M. *Prynne* contradicteth himſelfe in twelve particulars. Foure Counter-quærees to him. A diſcourſe of M. *Fox* the Author of the Booke of Martyrs, concerning three ſorts of perſons who are unwilling that there ſhould be a Diſcipline or power of Cenſures in the Church.

The

The Names of Writers or Workes cited and made use of in this Tractate.

IS. Abrabanel
Melchior Adamus
Ainsworth
Aeschines
Albaspinæus
Albinus Flaccus Alcuinus
Alex. Alensis
Algerus
Ambrosius
Ambrose the Monke
Ammonius Alexandrinus
Ampsincius
Dutch Annotations
English Annotations
Apollonius
Aquinas
Arabick N.T.
Aretius
Arias Montanus
Aristotle
Arnobius
Irish Articles of faith
Augustinus.
Azorius

B

BAlsamon
Io. Baptista de rubeis
Baronius
Basilius Magnus
Mr Bayne
Becanus
Becmanus
Beda
Bellarmine
Bertramus
Beza
Bilson
Brentius
Brochmand
Brughton
Mart. Bucerus
Gers. Bucerus
Budæus
Bullinger
Buxtorff

C

CAbeljavius
Cajetanus
Calvin
J. Camero
Camerarius
Canons of the African Church.
L. Capellus
D. Carthusianus
Cartwright
J. Casaubon
The Magdeburgian Centuriists
Chaldee Paraphrase
Chamierus
Chemnitius
Chrysostomus
D. Chytræus
Is. Clarus
Fr. à S. Clara
Clemens
Clemens Alexandrinus
Nic. de Clemangis
Iudocus Clichtoveus
J. Cloppenburgius
J. Coch
Mr Coleman
Aegid. de Coninck
Barthol. Coppen
Balthasar Corderius
Corpus Disciplinæ
Mr Cotoon
Tomes of Councels
Richardus Cowsin
Cyprian
Cyrill.

D

DAneus
R. David Ganz.
Demost.

Demosthenes
M. David Dickson
Didoclavius
Lud. de Dieu
Mich. Dilherrus
Diodati
The Directory of both Kingdomes
Dionysius Areopagita
Synod of Dort
Jesuits of Douay
J. Drusius
Duarenus
Durandus
Duranus

E

Elias
R. Eliezer
C. P. Empereur
Erastus
Erasmus
C. Estius
Esthius
Euthymius
Aben Ezra

F

Fabritius
Mr Fox
Ch. Francken
Hist. of the troubles at Francke ford
The Disciplin of the reformed Churches of France
Dr Fulke

G

P. Galatinus
Phil. Gamachæus
Gelenius
Laws and Statutes of Genevah
Genebrardus
Geo. Genzius
J. Gerhardus
Gesnerus
Sil. Glassius
Godwyn
Gomarus
Gorranus
Gregorius Magnus
Gregorius Thaumaturgus
Professors of Groning
Grotius
Gualther

H

Harmony of confessions
Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum
Haynis
Helmichius
Henningius
Hesshusius
Hesychius
Hieronie
Hilarius
M. Hilderham
P. Hirzelmannus
Frat. Holy-Oke
Festus Homius
Hugo de S. Victore
Hugo Cardinalis
L. Humfredus
Aegid. Hunnius
M. Hussey
Hutterus

I

King James
Jansenius
Illyricus
Innocentius 3.
Josephus
Josuæ levitæ Halichoth Olam.
Isidorus Hispalenses
Isidorus Pelusiota
Julius Cæsar
Fr. Junius
Justinus Martyr

K

Ecclesiasticus
Dr Kellet
C. Kirkebernus

L

Corn. a Lapide
Lavater
Laurentius de la barre
Mr Leigh
Nicolaus Lombardus
Lorinus
Lumbertus
Lyra

M

Accovius
Maimonides
Maldonat
Manasseh Ben. Israel
Conciliator
Mariana
Marlorat
Martial
M. Martinius
P. Martyr
Maximus
Medina
Meisnerus
Menochius
Mercerus
P. Moulin
Munsterus
Musculus

N

G. Nazianzen
J. Newenklaius
Nonnus
Novarinus

O

Oecumenius
Origen
Luc. Osiander

P

Pachymeres
Mr Paget
Pagnin
Paræus
Parker
Pasor
Pelargus
Pellicanus
Pemble
Philo the Jew
Piscator
Plato
Polanus
Mr Prynne

R

Rabanus Maurus
Raynolds
The Remonstrants
Revius
Rittangelius
D. Rivetus
Rupertus Tuitiensis
M. Rutherfurd

S

Emanuel Sa
Salmasius
Salmeron
M. Salmarsh
Sanctius
Sarazia
J. Scaliger
Scapula
Schindlerus
Jonas Schlichtingius
The Booke of Discipline of Scotland
Scotus Subtilis
M. Selden
The Septuagints
Smalcius
F. Socinus
Sopingius
Fr. Spanhemius
Spelman
Stegmannus
Strigelius
Suarez
Suidas
Sutlivius
Syriack N. T.

T

Tacianus
The Talmud
Tannerus
Tertullian
Theodoretus
Theophylactus
Tilenus
Tirinus
Titus Bostrorum Episcopus
Toletus
Tostatus
Tossanus
Trelcatius
Triglandius
Tuby

W

Walæus
Walafridus Strabo
Mr Io. Weiss

M

Mr Iohn Weymes of Craigton
Mr Iohn Weimes of Lathocker
Westhemerus
Whitgift
Whittakerus
Willet
J. Winkelmannus
Wolphius

V

GR. de Valentia
Vatablus
Vazquez
Vedelius
Victor Antiochenus
Gisb. Voetius
Gul. Vorstius
Hen. Vorstius
Gerhardus Vossius
Dionysius Vossius
Vrsinus

Z

ZAnchius
ZZepperus
Zonaras
Zuinglius.

T

Aarons

The Texts of Scripture explained or debated in this Tractate.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page.
		Geneſis.	
17.	14.	*That ſoul ſhall be cut off from his people.*	53. 54. 57. 59.
		Exodus.	
12.	43.	*There ſhall no ſtranger eat thereof.*	114.
23.	17.	*Three times in the year all thy Males ſhall appear before the Lord God.*	111.
24.	1.	*And ſeventy of the Elders of Iſrael.*	9. 10.
		Leviticus.	
1.	4.	*And he ſhall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering.*	73.
5.	1 to 6.	*And if a ſoul ſin &c. And it ſhall be, when he ſhall be guilty in one of theſe things, that he ſhall confeſſe that he hath ſinned in that thing.*	74, 75, 98, 122, 123, 124.
6.	2 to 8.	*If a ſoul ſin and commit a treſpaſſe &c.*	56. 104.
7.	20. 21.	*But the ſoul that eateth of the fleſh of the ſacrifice &c. having his uncleanneſſe upon him, even that ſoul ſhall be cut off &c.*	56.
20.	4. 5.	*Then I will ſet my face againſt that man, and againſt his family, and will cut him off.*	54, 55.
22.	3.	*That ſoul ſhall be cut off from my preſence.*	55.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
		Numbers.	
5.	2.	*Without the Camp ſhall ye put them.*	96. 97.
	6. 7.	*When a man or woman ſhall commit any ſin &c. then they ſhall confeſſe &c.*	76. 77. 78.
9.	6. 7.	*And there were certain men who were defiled by the dead body of a man, that they could not keep the Paſſeover &c.*	76. 77. 78.
	11. 12.	*But the ſoul that doth ought preſumptuouſly &c. that ſoul ſhall be cut off.*	95. to 101.
15.	30. 31.		56.
19.	13.	*That ſoul ſhall be cut off from Iſrael.*	52. 55.
		Deuteronomie.	
17.	8. 9. 10. 11. 12.	*If there ariſe a matter too hard for thee in judgement &c. Thou ſhalt come unto the Prieſts, the Levites, and unto the Judge &c.*	11. 12.
21.	2.	*Thy Elders and thy Judges.*	27.
23.	1. 2. 3.	*Shall not enter into the Congregation of the Lord.*	149.
	18.	*Thou ſhalt not bring the hire of a whore &c. into the Houſe of the Lord.*	88.
		1 Samuel.	
21.	4. 5.	*But there is hallowed bread, if the young men have kept themſelves at leaſt from women, &c.*	117.
26.	19.	*They have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord.*	385. 386.
		1 Kings.	
2.	26. 27	*Get thee to Anathoth &c. So Solomon thruſt out Abiathar from being Prieſt unto the Lord.*	137, 138.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page.
		2 Kings.	
6.	32.	*Eliſha ſate in his Houſe, and the Elders ſate with him.*	23.
11.	18.	*And the Prieſt appointed Officers over the Houſe of the Lord.*	37.
		1 Chronicles.	
23.	4.	*Six thouſand were Officers and Judges.* So 1 Chron. 26. 29.	13, 14.
		2 Chronicles.	
19.	8. 10, 11.	*Moreover in Jeruſalem did Jehoſhaphat ſet of the Levites, and of the Prieſts, and of the chief of the Fathers of Iſrael, for the judgement of the Lord, &c. Amariah the chief Prieſt is over you in all matters of the Lord, &c.*	14. to 17. 140. 141.
23.	19.	*And he ſet the porters at the gates of the Houſe of the Lord, that none which was unclean in any thing ſhould enter in.*	89, 90. 142. 143. 144.
		Ezra.	
10.	8.	*All his ſubſtance ſhould be forfeited, and himſelf ſeparated from the Congregation.*	68, 69, 70.
	11.	*Make Confeſſion unto the Lord.*	79, 80.
	17.	*And they made an end with all the men that had taken ſtrange wives, by the firſt day of the firſt moneth.*	121.
		Nehemiah.	
13.	3.	*They ſeparated from Iſrael all the mixed multitude.*	149. & ſeq.
	25.	*I contended with them and curſed them.*	70.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
		Job.	
36.	14.	*Their life is among the unclean.*	142.
		Pſalmes.	
2.	8.	*I ſhall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance.*	211.
15.	1.	*Lord who ſhall abide in thy Tabernacle? who ſhal dwell in thy holy hill? So* Pſ. 24. 3.	91.
50.	16.	*But unto the wicked God ſaith, What haſt thou to do &c.*	91. 92.
51.	Tit.	*A Pſalme of David when Nathan the Prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bathſheba.*	80. 81.
107.	32.	*Praiſe him in the Aſſembly of the Elders.*	24, 25.
118.	20.	*This gate of the Lord into which the righteous ſhall enter.*	90.
149.	6, 7, 8, 9.	*A two edged ſword in their hand: to execute vengeance upon the Heathen, and puniſhments upon the people: To bind their Kings with chains, and their Nobles with fetters of iron &c, this honour have all his Saints.*	420, 421.
		Proverbs.	
5.	8.	*Come not nigh the door of her Houſe.*	116.
20.	19.	*He that goeth about as a tale-bearer revealeth ſecrets.*	26.
		Iſaiah.	
52.	1.	*There ſhall no more come into thee the uncircumciſed and the unclean.*	107. 108.
		Jeremiah.	
7.	11.	*Is this houſe which is called by my name*	

become

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
		become a den of Robbers in your eyes?	
		For the Law ſhall not periſh from the	88.
18.	18.	*Prieſt, nor counſel from the wiſe, nor the word from the Prophet: come and let us ſmite him with the tongue.*	20, 21, 22.
		The Prieſts and the Prophets and all the	
26.	8, 9, 10, 11.	*people took him, ſaying, Thou ſhalt ſurely die &c. When the Princes of Judah heard*	18, 19, 20, 254, 255.
	16.	*theſe things, then they came up &c.*	

Ezechiel.

		O Son of man behold they ſhall put bands	
3.	25.	*upon thee.*	411.
7.	26.	*The Law ſhall periſh from the Prieſt, and Counſel from the Ancients.*	22, 23.
8.	1.	*I ſate in mine houſe, and the Elders of Judah ſate before me.*	24.
13.	9.	*They ſhall not be in the Aſſembly of my people.*	25, 26.
22.	26.	*They have put no difference between the holy and prophane, neither have they ſhewed difference between the unclean and the clean.*	117, 118, 119.
44.	7. 9.	*In that ye have brought into my Sanctuary ſtrangers uncircumciſed in heart &c.*	87. 105.
		And in controverſie they (the Prieſts)	
	24.	*ſhall ſtand in judgment, and they ſhal judge it according to my judgements.*	36, 37.

Haggai.

2.	13. 14.	*If one that is unclean by a dead body, &c. So is this people &c.*	547.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
		Zechariah.	
7.	2. 7.	*When they had ſent unto the houſe of God &c. to ſpeak unto the Prieſts which were in the houſe of the Lord of hoſts, and to the Prophets, ſaying, Should I weep &c.*	24.
		Matthew.	
3.	7.	*But when he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadduces come to his Baptiſme, he ſaid unto them, O generation of vipers &c.*	552, to 555.
5.	23,24.	*Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the Altar, and there remembreſt &c.*	82.
7.	6.	*Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither caſt ye your pearls before ſwine.*	548, to 551.
16.	28.	*There be ſome ſtanding here which ſhall not taſt of death, till they ſee the Son of man comming in his kingdom.*	293.
18.	15,16, 17.	*If thy brother ſhall treſpaſſe againſt thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone &c. Then take with thee one or two more &c. And if he ſhall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.*	294,295,296, and 350. to 407.
	18.	*Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe &c.*	407, to 423.
	19.	*If two of you ſhall agree on earth &c.*	416.
	20.	*Where two or three are gathered together in my Name &c.*	235, 236.
22.	9, 10.	*As many as ye ſhall find, bid to the marriage. So thoſe ſervants went out into the high wayes, and gathered together all, as*	572, 573.

Ch.	Verſ.	many as they found, both bad and good &c.	Page
22.	12.	Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment?	510.
23.	34.	I ſend unto you Prophets, and Wiſe-men, and Scribes.	21.
26.	20.	He ſate down with the twelve.	464. 465.
	21.	And as they did eat, he ſaid.	438.
	25.	Thou haſt ſaid.	470.
	59.	The chief Prieſts and Elders, and all the Councel. So Acts 4. 5.	26. & ſeq.
28.	18.	All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.	215 to 218.
	19.	Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt.	237.238.

Marke.

14.	23.	And they all drank of it.	449.

Luke.

6.	22.	And when they ſhall ſeparate you from their Company.	71.72.
12.	14.	Man, Who made me a Judge or a divider over you?	240.241. 242.
15.	22.23	Bring forth the beſt robe &c.	516.
17.	20.	The Kingdom of God commeth not with obſervation.	243.
18.	10.11	Two men went up into the Temple to	85.86.363.
	13.	pray, &c. And the Publican ſtanding afar off &c.	364.388.
22.	9.	Where wilt thou that we prepare?	465.466.
	17.18	Take this and divide it among your ſelves, &c.	437.
	21.	But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me, is with me on the Table.	437. 439.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
		John.	
4.	9.	*For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritanes.*	370.
8.	2. 3.	*He came again into the Temple &c.* *And the Scribes and Phariſees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery.*	86. 87.
9.	22.	*Should be put out of the Synagogue. So* John 12. 42. & 16. 2.	60. to 68.
	24.	*Give God the praiſe.*	79.
10.	23.	*And Jeſus walked in the Temple in Solomons porch. So* Acts 3. 11. and 5. 12.	93. 362.
13.	1.	*Before the Feaſt of the Paſſeover.*	462.
	2.	*And Supper being ended.*	441. 442. 463.
	26.	*He it is to whom I ſhall give a ſop.*	469. 470.
	27.	*That thou doſt do quickly.*	473. 474.
	30.	*He then having received the ſop, went immediatly out.*	441. to 446.
18.	28.	*And they themſelves went not into the judgement hall, leſt they ſhould be defiled; but that they might eat the Paſſeover.*	109.
	31.	*It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.*	31. 34.
	36.	*My Kingdom is not of this World.*	242.
20.	23.	*Whoſe ſoever ſins ye remit &c.*	418.
		Acts.	
6.	2.	*It is not reaſon that we ſhould leave the Word of God and ſerve Tables.*	310. 311.
10.	28.	*It is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another Nation.*	109. 371. to 374.
15.	6. 22. 23. 28.	*And the Apoſtles and Elders came together &c. Then pleaſed it the Apoſtles*	301. 305.

and

Ch.	Verſ.		Page.
		and Elders with the whole Church, to ſend choſen men &c. For it ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and to us, to lay upon you no grater burthen then theſe neceſſary things.	
16.	4.	*The Decrees that were ordained of the Apoſtles and Elders.*	305.
19.	18.	*And many that beleeved came and confeſſed, and ſhewed their deeds.*	170.
	39.	*It ſhal be determined in a lawful aſſembly.*	402.
20.	28.	*Over the whith the holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers.*	297,298,299
21.	28.	*And farther, brought Greeks alſo into the Temple, & hath polluted this holy place.*	361. 370.
22.	5.	*And all the eſtate of the Elders.*	27.
23.	28.29	*And when I would have known the cauſe wherefore they accuſed him, I brought him forth into their Councel &c.*	32.
25.	11.	*I appeale unto Cæſar.*	33. 255, 256.

Romans.

4.	11.	*A ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of the faith.*	499. 508.
12.	8.	*He that ruleth.*	283, 284.

1 Corinthians.

4.	1.	*Stewards of the myſteries of God.* So Tit. 1. 7.	299, 300.
5.	4.5.	*In the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, when ye are gathered together &c. to deliver ſuch a one to Sathan.*	239,296,297, 324,325,423, 424,435,436.
	6.	*A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.*	116, 117.
	8.	*Therefore let us keep the Feaſt.*	424.
	11.	*With ſuch a one, no not to eat.*	424, to 432. and 434.
	12.	*For what have I to do to judge them alſo that are without?*	435.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
5.	13.	*Therefore put away from among your ſelves that wicked perſon.*	57. 324, 325,
10.	1. to 10.	*I would not that ye ſhould be ignorant how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud &c. and did all eat the ſame ſpiritual meat, &c. Neither be ye Idolaters, as were ſome of them &c.*	433. 125. to 130.
	27.	*If any of them that believe not bid you to a Feaſt &c.*	377.
11.	3.	*The head of every man is Chriſt.*	204.
	21.	*For in eating every one taketh before other, his owne Supper.*	443.
	27.	*Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily. So v. 29.*	511. 512.
	28.	*But let a man examine himſelf &c.*	484.485.509.
	29.	*Eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf.*	510.545.546. 488.
12.	28.	*And God hath ſet ſome in the Church, &c. Governments.*	218.to224. 284
14.	32.	*And the ſpirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets.*	279. 280.
15.	24,25.	*Then commeth the end, when he ſhall have delivered up the Kingdom to God &c.*	197.
	28.	*Unto him who put all things under him.*	203.

2 Corinthians.

2.	6.	*This puniſhment which was inflicted of many.*	277.278.432.
	8.	*That ye would confirm your love towards him.*	290.291.
6.	14,15, 16,17.	*Be ye not unequally yoked together? &c. Wherefore come out from among them &c.*	108.
10.	6.	*And having in readineſſe to revenge all diſobedience.*	288.to 290.

Ch.	Verſ.	Galatians.	Page.
2.	12. 14.	*For before that certain came from Iames, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew, &c.*	373.
5.	12.	*I would they were even cut off which trouble you.*	285. to 288.
		Epheſians.	
1.	21. 22. 23.	*Far above all principality and power &c. and gave him to be the head over all things &c.*	224. to 229.
4.	11.	*And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets &c.*	223.
		Philippians.	
2.	9. 10.	*And given him a Name which is above every name. That at the name of Ieſus &c.*	203, 204.
		Coloſſians.	
1.	15. 16. 17. 18.	*Who is the image of the inviſible God &c. And he is the head of the body the Church.*	201.
		1 Theſſalonians.	
5.	12.	*Them which are over you in the Lord.*	269. 270. 271.
		2 Theſſalonians.	
3.	14.	*Note that man, and have no Company with him, that he may be aſhamed.*	281. 282. 283.
		1 Timothy.	
1.	20.	*Whom I have delivered to Sathan, that they may learn not to blaſpheme.*	189.
2.	2.	*For Kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all Godlineſſe and Honeſty.*	188.
5.	17.	*The Elders that rule well.*	268. 269.

Ch.	Verſ.		Page
	19.	*Againſt an Elder receive not an accuſation but before two or three witneſſes.*	275.
6.	15.	*The King of kings, and Lord of lords.*	211.212.
		Titus.	
3.	10.	*A man that is an heretick after the firſt and ſecond admonition reject.*	276.277.
		Hebrews.	
1.	2.	*Whom he hath appointed heir of all things.*	202.
2.	8.	*He left nothing that is not put under him. But now we ſee not yet &c.*	203. 227.
10.	26.	*For if we ſin wilfully &c. there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſins.*	56.
13.	17.	*Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves.*	270. to 275.
		1 Peter.	
5	2.	*Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the overſight thereof.*	298. 299.
		The third Epiſtle of John.	
	10.	*And caſteth them out of the Church.*	67. 68.
		Revelation.	
2.	14. 20.	*Becauſe thou haſt there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam.*	280.

Typographical

Typographical Faults to be thus amended.

PAge 8. line 20. read *Accademiæ.* pag. 13. l. ult. *nst*, read *nor.* Pag. 25. l. 35. read *enter.* Pag. 44. l. 29. read *but the common sentence of the Hebrew Doctors.* Pag. 46. marg. l. 13. *sa* read *se*, Ibid. l. 15. *quo* read *qui.* Pag. 48. marg. l. 8. read *vorare.* Pag. 51. l. 29. כרת read כרת. Pag. 57. l. 19. read *a soul.* Pag. 58. l. 29. read *sortis.* Pag. 62. l. 1. read *Ludovicus.* Pag. 115. l. 16. read *or an.* Pag. 119. l. 19. read וירע. Pag. 120. l. 16. גר. Pag. 121. l. 33. read *Col.* 2. 22. Pag. 134. marg. l. 11. read *legem.*

Pag. 169. l. 22. *ite* read *este.* Pag. 173. marg. l. 30. *quia* read *qua.* Pag. 175. l. 17. *penere* read *imponere.* Pag. 205. l. 4. read *solamus.* Pag. 210. l. 36. read ὅ. Pag. 211. l. 36. read *Jesus.* Pag. 216 l. 27. *no* read *not.* Pag. 228. l. 4. read *things.* Pag. 252. l. 29. read *per intellectum.* Pag. 274. l. 16, 17. read *Theophylacts.* Pag. 276. l. 18. read παρατέθωκα. Pag. 279 l. 3. read πόνοις. Pag. 281. l. 29. read *Theophylact.* Ibid. l. 37. read σημειῶδες. Pag. 282. l. 8. read נָסָה. Pag. 288. l. 17. read *plerique.* Pag. 311. l. 1. read *must be.* Pag. 336. l ult. read *fraenetur.* Pag. 341. l. 25. read *Anathematismus.* Pag. 343. l. 13. read *weight.* Pag. 352. l. 16, 17. read *concession.* Ibid. l. 23. read *writings.* Pag. 379. l. 4. read *Maimon.* Pag. 387. l. 33. read *with that which was.* Ibid. l. 34. 35. dele *that which.* Pag. 391. l. 5. read *Quæst.* 95. Pag. 392. marg. l. 16. read *respipiscit.* Pag. 393. l. 26. read *Erastians.* Ibid. l. 37. read *first.* Pag. 401. l. 4. read *ye bind.* Pag. 402. l. 33 read *Their.* Pag. 408. l. 11. read אמר. Ibid. l. 22. ὃν read *or.* Ibid. l. 36. אֲמַר. Pag. 409. l. 30. read *abjiciatur.* Pag. 421. l. 19. read *with such a power.* Pag. 432. l. 35. 36. read, *if the Apostle had not written to dissuade them and take them off.* Pag. 436. l. 6. read *noteth.* Pag. 497. l. 2. read *causalitas.* Ibid. l. 7. read *causalitas.* Pag. 524. l. 16. read *refreshing.* Pag. 568. l. 16. read *of those that are.*

Aarons Rod blossoming:

OR,

The Divine Ordinance of

Church-government VINDICATED.

The first Booke.

Of the Jewish Church-government.

CHAP. I.

That if the Erastians could prove what they alledge concerning the Iewish Church Government, yet in that particular the Jewish Church could not be a president to the Christian.

OBserving that very much of *Erastus* his strength, and much of his followers their confidence, lieth in the old Testament, and Jewish Church, which (as they averre) knew no such distinction, as Civill Government, and Church Government; Civill Justice, and Church Discipline; I have thought good, first of all, to remove that great stumbling-block,

that our way may afterward lie fair and plain before us. I doe heartily acknowledge, that what we finde to have been an Ordinance, or an approved practice in the Jewish Church, ought to be a rule and patterne to us, such things onely excepted which were typicall, or temporall, that is, for which there were speciall reasons proper to that infancy of the Church, and not common to us. Now, if our oppolites could prove that the Jewish Church was nothing but the Jewish State, and that the Jewish Church-government, was nothing but the Jewish State-government, and that the Jewes had never any supreame Sanhedrin but one onely, and that civil, and such as had the temporall coercive power of Magistracy (which they will never be able to prove) yet there are divers considerable reasons, for which that could be no prefident to us.

First, *Casaubon exerc.* 13. *anno* 31. *num.* 10. proves out of *Maimonides*, that the Sanhedrin was to be made up (if possible) wholly of Priests and Levites; and that if so many Priests and Levites could not be found, as were fit to be of the Sanhedrin, in that case some were assumed out of other Tribes. Howbeit I hold not this to be agreeable to the first institution of the Sanhedrin. But thus much is certaine, that Priests and Levites were members of the Jewish Sanhedrin, and had an authoritative decisive suffrage in making decrees, and inflicting punishments, as well as other members of the Sanhedrin. *Philo* the Jew *de vita Mosis* pag. 530. saith that he who was found gathering sticks upon the Sabbath, was brought *ad principem & sacerdotum consistorium*, ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα ᾧ συνήδρευον μὲν ἱερεῖς. that is, *to the Prince or chiefe Ruler* (meaning *Moses*) *together with whom the Priests did sit and judge in the Sanhedrin.* *Jehosaphat* did set of the Levites, of the Priests, and of the chiefe of the Fathers of *Israel*, for the judgement of the Lord, &c. 2 *Chro.* 19. 8.

Secondly, the people of *Israel* had Gods own Judiciall Law given by *Moses*, for their civill Law: and the Priests and Levites in stead of civill Lawyers.

Thirdly, the Sanhedrin did punish no man, unlesse admonition had been first given to him for his amendment. *Maimon. de fundam. legis cap.* 5. *sect.* 6. (yea saith *Gul. Vorstius* upon the place,

place, though a man had killed his parents, the Sanhedrin did not punish him unlesse he were first admonished) and when witnesses were examined, seven questions were propounded to them, one of which was, whether they had admonished the offender, as the *Talmud* it self tels us *ad tit.* Sanhedrin *cap.* 5. *sect.* 1.

Fourthly, the Sanhedrin *respondebat de Jure*, did interpret the Law of God, and determine controversies, concerning the sence and intent thereof. *Deut.* 17. 8, 9, 10, 11. and it was on this manner as the *Jerusalem Talmud* in Sanhedrin *cap.* 10. *sect.* 2. records. *There were there* (in *Jerusalem*) *three assemblies of Judges: one sitting at the entry to the mountaine of the Sanctuary: another sitting at the doore of the Court: the third sitting in the Conclave made of cut stone. First, addresse was made to that which sate at the ascent of the mountaine of the Sanctuary: then the Elder* (who came to represent the cause which was too hard for the Courts of the Cities) *said on this manner. I have drawne this sence from the holy Scripture, my fellows have drawn that sence. I have taught thus, my fellows so and so. If they had learned what is to be determined in that cause, they did communicate it unto them. If not, they went forward together to the Judges sitting at the doore of the Court: by whom they were instructed, if they* (*after the laying forth of the difficulty*) *knew what resolution to give. Otherwise all of them jointly had recourse to the great Sanhedrin. For from it doth the Law go forth unto all Israel.* It is added in *Exc. Gemar. Sanhed. cap.* 10. *sect.* 1. that the Sanhedrin did sit in that roome of cut stone (which was in the Temple) from the morning to the evening daily sacrifice. The Sanhedrin did judge cases of Idolatry, apostasie, false Prophets, &c. *Talm. Hieros. in Sanhed. cap.* 1. *sect.* 5.

Now all this being unquestionably true of the Jewish Sanhedrin: if we should suppose, that they had no supreme Sanhedrin but that which had the power of civill Magistracy, then I aske where is that Christian State, which was, or is, or ought to be moulded according to this patterne. Must Ministers have vote in Parliament? Must they be civill Lawyers? must all criminall and capitall Judgements be according to the Judiciall Law of *Moses*, and none otherwise? Must there be no civill punishment, without previous admonition of the offender? Must Parliaments sit, as it were in the Temple of God, and interpret Scripture,

which sence is true, and which false, and determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, and judge of all false doctrines? yet all this must be, if there be a paralell made with the Jewish Sanhedrin. I know some divines hold, that the Judiciall Law of *Moses*, so far as concerneth the punishments of sins against the morall Law, Idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, adultery, theft, &c. ought to be a rule to the Christian Magistrate. and for my part, I wish more respect were had to it, and that it were more consulted with. This by the way. I am here only shewing, what must follow, if the Jewish Government be taken for a president, without making a distinction of Civil & Church government. Surely, the consequences will be such, as I am sure our opposites will never admit of, and some of which (namely concerning the civill places or power of Ministers, and concerning the Magistrates authority to interpret Scripture) ought not to be admitted.

Certainly, if it should be granted that the Jewes had but one Sanhedrin, yet there was such an intermixture of Civill and Ecclesiasticall both persons and proceedings, that there must be a partition made of that power, which the Jewish Sanhedrin did exercise, which (taken whole and entire together) can neither sute to our Civill nor to our Ecclesiasticall Courts. Nay, while the Erastians appeale to the Jewish Sanhedrin (suppose it now to be but one) they doe thereby ingage themselves to grant unto Church officers a share at least (yea a great share) in Ecclesiasticall government: for so they had in the Supreme Sanhedrin of the Jewes.

And further the Jewes had their *Synagoga magna*, which *Grotius* on *Matth.* 10. 17. distinguisheth from the Sanhedrin of 71. for both Prophets and others of place and power among the people *præter τὸν συνέδριον*, besides the members of that Sanhedrin were members of that extraordinary assembly, which was called *the great Synagogue*, such as that Assembly *Ezra* 10. which did decree forfeiture and separation from the Congregation, to be the punishment of such as would not gather themselves unto *Jerusalem*: in which assembly were others beside those of the Sanhedrin. Of the men of the great Synagogue I read in *Tzemach David* pag. 56. *edit. Hen. Vorst.* that they did receive the tradi-

traditions from the Prophets; and it is added *Viri Synagogæ magnæ ordinarunt nobis preces nostras. The men of the great Synagogue did appoint unto us our prayers*, meaning their Liturgies, which they fancy to have been so instituted. The Hebrews themselves controvert, whether all the men of the great Synagogue did live at one and the same time, or successively; but that which is most received among them, is, that these men did flourish all at one time, as is told us in the passage last cited, where also these are named as men of the great Synagogue, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Zerubbabel, Mordechai, Ezra, Jehoshua, Seria, Rehaliah, Mispar, Rechum, Nehemias. Rambam* addeth, *Chananiah, Mischael*, and *Azariah*.

Finally, as Prophets, Priests, and Scribes of the Law of God had an interest in the *Synagoga magna* after the Captivity, so we read of occasionall and extraordinary Ecclesiasticall Synods before the Captivity, as that assembly of the Priests and Levites under *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chro.*29. 4.15. and that erring Synod of the 400 Prophets, 1 *Kings* 22.6. *Herod* also gathered together the chiefe Priests and Scribes, *Matth.*2.4. I conclude, that if it should be granted there was no Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jewes, distinct from the civill, yet as the necessity of a distinct Ecclesiasticall Government among us, is greater then it was among them (in respect of the foure considerations above mentioned) so likewise the Priests had a great deale more power and authority in the Jewish Church, (not onely by occasionall Synods, but by their interest in *Synagoga magna*, and in the civill Sanhedrin it selfe) then the Erastians are willing that Church officers should have in the Christian Church.

Chap. II.

That the Jewish Church was formally distinct from the Jewish State or Common-wealth.

IT hath been by some (with much confidence and scorne of all who say otherwise) averred that Excommunication and Church-government distinct from the Civill, hath no patterne for it in the Jewish Church. *I am sure* (saith Mr *Coleman* in his

his *Brotherly examination re-examined*, pag. 16.) *the best reformed Church that ever was went this way, I meane the Church of Israel, which had no distinction of Church government and Civill government.* Hast thou appealed unto *Cæsar?* unto *Cæsar* shalt thou goe. Have you appealed to the Jewish Church? thither shall you goe. Wherefore I shall endeavour to make these five things appeare: 1. That the Jewish Church was formally distinct from the Jewish State. 2. That there was an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin and Government distinct from the Civill. 3. That there was an Ecclesiasticall Excommunication, distinct from Civill punishments. 4. That in the Jewish Church there was also a publike exomologesis or declaration of repentance, and thereupon a reception or admission againe of the offender to fellowship with the Church in the holy things. 5. That there was a suspension o fthe prophane from the Temple and Passeover.

First, the Jewish Church was formally distinct from the Jewish State. I say *formally*, because ordinarily they were not distinct *materially*, the same persons being members of both. But formally they were distinct, (as now the Church and State are distinct among us Christians.) 1. In respect of distinct lawes; the Ceremoniall Law was given to them in reference to their Church state, the Judiciall Law was given to them in reference to their Civill State. *Is. Abrabanel de capite fidei cap.* 13. putteth this difference between the Lawes given to *Adam* and to the sonnes of *Noah*, and the divine Law given by *Moses:* that those Laws were given for conservation of humane society *and are in the classis of Judiciall or civill Laws.* But the divine Law given by *Moses*, doth direct the soule to its last perfection and end. I doe not approve the difference which he puts between these Lawes. This onely I note, that he distinguisheth Judiciall or Civill Laws for conservation of society, (though given by God) from those Laws which are given to perfect the soule, and to direct it to its last end, such as he conceives the whole morall and ceremoniall Law of *Moses* to be. *Halichoth Olam tract.* 5 *cap.* 2. tels us that such and such Rabbies were followed in the ceremoniall Lawes: other Rabbies followed in the Judiciall Lawes. 2. In respect of distinct acts: they did not worship God and offer Sacrifices in the Temple, nor call upon the name of Lord, nor give

give thanks, nor receive the Sacraments as that State, but as that Church. They did not punish evill doers by mulcts, imprisonment, banishment, burning, stoning, hanging, as that Church, but as that State. 3. In respect of controversies; some causes and controversies did concerne the Lords matters, some the Kings matters, 2 *Chro.* 19. 11. To judge between blood and blood was one thing. To judge between Law and Commandement, between Statutes and judgements; that is, to give the true sence of the Law of God when it was controverted, was another thing. 4. In respect of Officers: the Priests and Levites were Church-officers. Magistrates and Judges not so, but were Ministers of the State. The Priests might not take the Sword out of the hand of the Magistrates. The Magistrates might not offer Sacrifice nor exercise the Priests office. 5. In respect of continuance, when the *Romans* tooke away the Jewish State and civill Government, yet the Jewish Church did remaine, and the *Romans* did permit them the liberty of their religion. And now though the Jewes have no Jewish State, yet they have Jewish Churches. Whence it is, that when they tell where one did or doth live, they doe not mention the Town, but the Church: *In the holy Church at Venice, at Frankford, &c.* See *Buxtorf. lex. Rabin.* pag. 1983. 6. In respect of variation. The constitution and Government of the Jewish State was not the same, but different, under *Moses* and *Joshua*, under the *Judges*, under the Kings, and after the Captivity. But we cannot say, that the Church was new modelld as oft as the State was. 7. In respect of members. For as [a] M. *Selden* hath very well observed concerning that sort of Proselytes, who had the name of *Proselyti Justitiæ*; they were initiated into the Jewish religion by Circumcision, Baptisme, and Sacrifice: and they were allowed not onely to worship God apart by themselves, but also to come into the Church and Congregation of *Israel*, and to be called by the name of Jewes: nevertheless they were restrained and secluded from Dignities, Magistracies and preferments in the Jewish Republique, and from divers marriages, which were free to the Israelites: Even as strangers initiated and associated into the Church of *Rome*, have not therefore the priviledge of *Roman* Citizens. Thus M. *Selden*, who like hath

[a] *De Jure natur. & Gentium lib. 2. cap. 4. Proselytus Justitiæ utcunque novato patriæ nomine Judæus diceretur, non tam quidem civis Judaicus simpliciter censendus esset quam peregrinus semper, cui jura quamplurima inter cives.* See the *lib. 5. c. 20.*

hath thereby made it manifest, that there was a distinction of the Jewish Church and Jewish State, because those Proselytes [b] being imbodied into the Jewish Church as Church members, and having a right to communicate in the holy Ordinances among the rest of the people of God, yet were not properly members of the Jewish State, nor admitted to Civill priviledges: Whence it is also that the names of Jewes and Proselytes were used distinctly, *Acts* 2.10.

[a] *Buxtorf. lexic. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin pag.* 408 *Proselyti justitiæ sunt qui non rerum externarum, sed solius religionis causâ, & gloriæ Dei studio, religionem Judaicam amplectuntur, & totam legem Mosis dicto modo recipiunt. Hi natis Judæis habentur æquales*: understand in an Ecclesiasticall, not in a Civill capacity. In which sence also *Matthias Martinius in lexic. philol.* pag. 2922. saith that these Proselytes, *cum ad sacrorum Judaicorum communionem admittebantur, & c. veri Iudæi censebantur*; and that to be made a Proselyte, and to be made a Jew, are used promiscuously in the Rabbinicall writings. So also *Drusius prælect. l.* 4. *in Io.* 12. 20.

Chap. III.

That the Jewes had an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin and Government distinct from the Civill.

I Come to the second point, that there was an Ecclesiasticall government, and an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jews. This distinction of the two Sanhedrins, the Civill and the Ecclesiasticall, is maintained by *Zepperus de polit. eccles.* l. 3. cap. 7. *Junius in Deut.* 17. *Piscator ibid. Wolphius in* 2. *Reg.* 23. *Gerhard Harm. de pass. cap.* 8. *Godwin Moses and Aaron lib.* 5. *cap.* 1. *Bucerus de gubern. eccl.* pag. 61, 62. *Walæus Tom.* 2. pag. 9. *Pelargus in Deut.* 17. *Sopingius ad bonam fidem Sibrandi* pag. 261. *et seq.* The Dutch Annotations on *Deut.* 17. & 2 *Chron.* 19. *Bertramus de polit. Jud.* cap. 11. *Apollonii jus Majest. part.* 1. p. 374. *Strigelius in* 2. *Paralip. cap.* 19. The professours of *Groning. (Vide Judicium facult. Theol. academiæ Groninganæ, apud Cabeljav. def. poteest. Eccl.* pag. 54.) I remember *Raynolds* in the Conference with *Hart* is of the same opinion. Also M. *Paget* in his defence of Church government, pag. 41. Besides divers others. I shall onely adde the Testimony of *Constantinus L' Empereur*, a man singularly well acquainted with the Jewish antiquities, who hath

hath expreſſed himſelfe concerning this point both in his Annotations upon *Bertram* pag. 389. and *Annot. in Cod. Middoth.* pag. 187,188. The latter of theſe two paſſages you have here in the [c] Margin, expreſſing not only his opinion, but the ground of it.

[c] *Cæterùm ſupremus Senatus cujus in hoc conclavi ſedes, duplex fuiſſe videtur, pro rerum Eccleſiaſticarum & politicarum diverſitate: quoniam* Deut 17.12. *ubi de ſupremis Senatoribus agitur, manifeſtè Sacerdos à Judice diſtinguitur; ad ſacerdotem amant ad Judicem i.e. Sacerdotes aut Judices, ut com. 9. indicio eſt, ubi pro Sacerdote ponuntur Sacerdotes. Adde Iehoſhaphatum, cum Iudicia Hieroſolymis reſtauraret, duos ordines conſtituiſſe, Sacerdotes & Capita familiarum, ad judicium Dei & ad litem: ſimiliter duos præſides com* 11. *unum ad omnem cauſam Dei: alterum ſcilicet ducem Judæorum ad omne negotium Regis. Quibus ſuccinunt verba* Jerem. 19. 1. *quibus Seniores populi & Senioribus Sacerdotum diſtinguuntur. Quocirca in N. T. ſublato (ut videtur) per Herodem, uno ſynedrio, ſc. politico; alterum Apoſtolorum ſeculo ſuperfuit, in quo politici etiam manebant reliquiæ: nam ab Eccleſiaſticis Seniores populi diſtinguuntur,* Matth. 26. 3. 59 & 27. verſ. 1. *Ni magis placeat, quod ab aliis obſervatum fuit, Herodem, ſublatis 70. Senioribus è familia Davidica, alios inferiores ſubſtituiſſe: quod judiciorum quibuſdam exemplis firmari videtur. Adeo ut illis temporibus duplex quoque Synedrium fuerit, quamvis utriuſque Senatores ſubinde convenirent: quo fortè referendum τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον, quod* Matth. 26. 59. Marc. 14. 55. & 15. 1. Acts 22. 30. *occurrit. (Quin etiam cap 1. cod. Jomæ, eadem diſtinctio his verbis confirmatur (ubi de præparatione Sacerdotis magni ad diem expiationis agitur) tradunt eum Seniores domus Iudicii, Senioribus Sacerdotii.*

And it is no obſcure footſtep of the Eccleſiaſticall Sanhedrin, [d] which is cited out of *Elias*, by *D. Buxtorf* in his *Lexicon Chald. Talmud. & Rabbin.* p. 1514.

[d] *Propter meritum aſſeſſorum Synedrii, qui occupati ſunt in lege, & illuminant Iudicium. Et deſcendit in Babyloniam ad concilium Sapientum. Id non fuit Synedrium Judicum & Magiſtratus ſummi, ſed collegium doctorum.*

The firſt inſtitution of an Eccleſiaſticall Sanhedrin appeareth to me to be held forth *Exod.* 24. 1. where God ſaith to *Moſes*, *Come up unto the Lord, thou and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and ſeventy of the Elders of Iſrael.* It is a controverſie among Interpreters who thoſe ſeventy Elders were. [f] *Toſtatus* maketh it cleare, that they were not the ſeventy Elders choſen for the government of the Common-wealth, *Num.* 11. Nor yet the Judges choſen by the advice of *Jethro*, *Exod.* 18. Nor yet any other Judges which had before time Judged the people. Theſe three negatives *Willet* upon the place holdeth with *Toſtatus*. Not the firſt: for this was done at Mount *Sinai*, ſhortly after their comming out of *Egypt*. But on the twenty day of the ſecond moneth, in the ſecond yeere, they tooke their journey from *Sinai* to the Wilderneſſe of *Paran*, *Num.* 10. 11,12. and there

[f] *In Exod. 24. Quæſt. 3.*

pitched at *Hibroth-hattaavath* Num. 33. 16. where the seventy Elders were chosen to relieve *Moses* of the burthen of Government. So that this election of seventy *Exod.* 24. was before that election of seventy *Num* 11. Not the second: for this election of seventy *Exod.* 24. was before that election of Judges by *Jethros* advice *Exod.* 18. *Jethro* himselfe not having come to *Moses* till the end of the first yeere, or the beginning of the second yeere after the comming out of *Egypt*, and not before the giving of the Law: which *Tostatus* proves by this argunent, The Law was given the third day, after they came to *Sinai*; but it was impossible that *Jethro* should in the space of three daies, heare that *Moses* and the people of *Israel* were in the wildernesse of *Sinai*, and come there unto them, that *Moses* should goe forth and meet him, and receive him, and entertaine him; that *Jethro* should observe the manner of *Moses* his government, in litigious judgement from morning till evening, and give counsell to rectifie it; that *Moses* should take course to helpe it; how could all this be done in those three daies, which were also appointed for sanctifying the people against the receiving of the Law? Therefore [g] he concludeth that the story of *Jethro Exod.* 18. is an anticipation. Lastly, he saith, the seventy Elders mentioned *Exod.* 24. could not be Judges who did judge the people before *Jethro* came, because *Jethro* did observe the whole burthen of government did lie upon *Moses* alone, and there were no other Judges.

g *In Exod.* 18. *Quest.* 2.

Now it is to be observed, that the seventy Elders chosen and called *Exod.* 24. were also invested with [h] authority in judging controversies, wherein *Aaron* or *Hur* were to preside vers. 14. They are joyned with *Aaron*, *Nadab*, and *Abihu*, and are called up as a Representative of the whole Church, when God was making a Covenant with his people. Tis after the Judiciall lawes, *Exod.* 21. & 22. & 23. and that 24 Chapter is a transition to the ceremoniall lawes concerning the worship of God, and structure of the Tabernacle, which are to follow. Neither had the seventy Elders (of which now I speake) any share of the Supreme civill Government, to judge hard Civill causes, and to receive appeals concerning those things from the inferiour Judges; for all this did still lie upon *Moses* alone,

h *Menochius in Exod.* 24. 14. *redire ad populum, ut illum regatis, & in officio contineatis. Pelargus* upon the place saith that *Moses* would not leave the Church without Rulers to avoyd the danger of popular anarchy.

alone, *Num.* 11. 14. Furthermore they saw the glory of the Lord, and were admitted to a sacred banquet, and to eat of the Sacrifices in his presence *Exod.* 24. 5, 10, 11. and were thereby confirmed in their calling. All which laid together may seem to amount to no lesse then a solemne interesting and investing of them into an Ecclesiasticall authority.

The next proofe for the Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin shall be taken from *Deut.* 17. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. where observe 1. Tis agreed upon both by Jewish and Christian Expositors, that this place holds forth a supreme civill Court of Judges, and the authority of the civill Sanhedrin is mainly grounded on this very Text. Now if this Text hold forth a superior civill Jurisdiction (as is universally acknowledged) it holds forth also a superior Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction distinct from the Civill. For the Text carrieth the authority and sentence of the Priests as high, as the authority and sentence of the Judges, and that in a disjunctive way, as two powers, (not one) and each of them binding, respectively, and in its proper sphere. 2. The Hebrew Doctors tell us of three kinds of causes, which being found difficult were transmitted from the inferiour Courts to those at *Ierusalem*. 1. capitall causes. 2. mulcts. 3. leprosie, and the judgement of clean or unclean. Now this third belonged to the cognizance and judgement of the Priests. Yea the Text it self holdeth forth two sorts of causes, and controversies, some forensicall between blood and blood: some ceremoniall *between stroke and stroke*; not onely *Hierome*, but the Chaldee, and Greek, readeth, *between leprosie and leprosie*. *Grotius* noteth, the Hebrew word is used for leprosie, many times in one chapter, *Lev.* 13. *Plea and plea* seemeth common to both, there being difference of judgement concerning the one and the other. 3. Here are two Iudicatories distinguished by the disjunctive *Or* V. 12. which we have both in the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, and in our English Translation; so that vers. 9. *and* is put for *or*, as *Grotius* noteth, expounding that verse by vers. 12. And as the Priests and Levites are put in the plurall V. 9. the like must be understood of the *Iudge*, whereby we must understand *Iudges*, and so the Chaldee readeth V. 9. even as (saith *Ainsworth*) many Captains are in the Hebrew called *an head*, 1 *Chron.* 4. 42. And

so you have there, references of difficult cases from inferior Courts, to the Priests or to the Judges at *Ierusalem*. 4. There is also some intimation of a twofold sentence; one concerning *the meaning of the Law, according to the sentence of the Law, which they shall teach thee*, V. 11. and this belonged to the Priests, *Mal.* 2. 7. *for the Priests* (its not said *the Iudges*) *lips should preserve knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his mouth.* Another concerning *matter of fact, and according to the judgement which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do. Grotius* upon the place acknowledgeth a judgement of the Priests distinct from that of the Judges: and he addeth a *simile* from the *Roman* Synod consisting of seventy Bishops which was consulted in weighty controversies. But he is of opinion that the Priests and Levites did onely endeavour to satisfie and reconcile the dissenting parties, which if they did, well, if not, that then they referred the reasons of both parties to the Sanhedrin, who gave forth their decree upon the whole matter. The first part of that which he saith, helpeth me. But this last hath no ground in the Text, but is manifestly inconsistent therewith, V. 12. *The man that will doe presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest, or unto the Iudge, even that man shall die.* Which proves, [1] that the judgement of both was supreme *in suo genere*, that is, if it was a controversie ceremoniall, between leprosie and leprosie, or between clean and unclean, *Lev.* 10. 9, 10, 11. *Ezech.* 22. 26. or dogmaticall aud doctrinall, concerning the sence of the Law, and answering *de Iure*, when the sence of the Law was controverted by the Judges of the Cities, then he that would not stand to the sentence of the Eccleiasticall Sanhedrin, whereof the high Priest was president, was to die the death. But if the cause was criminall, as between blood and blood, wherein the nature or proofe of the fact, could not be agreed upon, by the Judges of the Cities, then he that would not submit to the decree of the civill Sanhedrin at *Ierusalem* should die the death. And thus the English Divines in their late annotations, give the sence according to the disjunction, V. 12. *While the Priest bringeth warrant from God for the sentence which he passeth in the cause of man, Ezech.* 44. 23, 24. *he that contumaciously disobeyeth him disobeyeth God, Luke* 10. 16. *Matth.* 10. 14. *The cause is alike if*

[1] *Erastus Confirm. thes. lib. 4 cap. 3. Moses aperte ait, interficiendum esse illum, qui vel Sacerdotis sententiæ vel Iudicis assentire nollet. Non ergo liberum facit ab illo ad hunc provocare.*

if the just sentence of a competent Iudge be contemned in secular affaires.

In the third place, we read that *David* did thus divide the Levites (at that time eight and thirty thousand) foure and twenty thousand of them were to set forward the work of the house of the Lord, foure thousand were porters, and foure thousand praised the Lord with instruments, and six thousand of them were made some *schoterim* Officers, and some *schophtim* Judges, 1 *Chro.*23.4. Some understand by *Schoterim* Rulers, or those who were over the charge. To speak properly *schophtim* were those that gave sentence; *schoterim* those that lookt to the execution of the sentence, and to the keeping of the law, like the νομοφύλακες among the Grecians: (for νομοθεσία was one thing, νομοφυλακία another.) So 1 *Chro.*26.29. *Chenaniah and his sonnes were for the outward businesse over Israel, for Officers* (or *Rulers or over the charge*) *and Iudges:* that is, they were not tied to attendance and service in the Temple, as the Porters and singers, and those that did service about the Sacrifices, Lights, Washings, and such like things in the Temple: but they [k] were to judge and give sentence concerning the law and the meaning thereof, when any such controversie should be brought before them from any of the Cities in the Land: They were not appointed to be Officers and Judges over the rest of the Levites to keepe them in order (for which course was taken in another way) but to be Rulers and Judges *over Israel*, saith the Text, in *the outward businesse* which came from without to *Ierusalem*, in judging of which peradventure they were to attend by course, or as they should be called. If any say that all those Levites who were Judges did not sit in judgement at *Ierusalem*, but some of them in severall Cities of the Land, that there might be the easier accesse to them; I can easily grant it, and I verily believe it was so, and it maketh the more for a Church government in particular Cities, which was subordinate to the Ecclesiasticall Sanh drin at *Ierusalem*. However the Levites had a ruling power, and *Deut.*31.28. those who are *schoterim* in the originall, the Septuagints call γραμματεισαγωγεῖς, *Hierome, Doctores*, because their Teachers were Officers over the charge, and had a share in Government. Now no man can imagine that there were no other Officers over the charge not Judges in

k *Menochius in 1. Paral.*23.4. *idem sunt præpositi & Judices, quorum munus erat Israelitarum causas quæ juxta legem finiebantur, judicare, quod patet ex 2. Paral.*19.8. *ubi habemus* constituit Iehosaphat in Jerusalem levitas & sacerdotes, & Principes familiarum ex Israel, ut judicium & causam domini judicarent.

in *Iſrael*, except the Levites onely; for it followeth in that ſame Story, 1 *Chro.*28.1. *And David aſſembled all the Princes of Iſrael, the Princes of the Tribes, and the Captains of the Companies that miniſtred to the King by courſe, & the Captains over the thouſands, &c.* Nor yet wil any man ſay, that the Levites were Officers over the charge, and Judges of the ſame kind, in the ſame manner, or for the ſame ends, with the civill Rulers and Judges, or the military Commanders; or that there was no diſtinction between the ruling power of the Princes, and the ruling power of the Levites. Where then ſhall the difference lie, if not in this, that there was an Eccleſiaſticall Government, beſides the Civill and Military? I grant thoſe Levites did rule and judge not onely *in all the buſineſſe of the Lord*, but alſo *in the ſervice of the King*, 1 *Chro.* 26.30,32. But the reaſon was, becauſe the Jewes had no other civill Law, but Gods owne Law, which the Prieſts and Levites were to expound. So that it was proper for that time, and there is not the like reaſon that the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt in the New Teſtament ſhould judge or rule in civill affairs: (nay it were contrary to the rule of Chriſt and his Apoſtles for us to do ſo) yet the Levites their judging and governing in all the buſines of the Lord, is a pattern left for the entruſting of Church officers in the New Teſtament with a power of Churchgovernment: there being no ſuch reaſon for it, as to make it peculiar to the old Teſtament, and not common to the New.

1 *Salmaſ. apparat. ad libros de Primatu p.302. Quæ ad res ſacras ac divinas pertinebant, de his præcipue judicium Sacerdotum fuit, de aliis civilibus & regalibus, præſides à rege conſtituti, vt patet ex lib.2.* Chro. *cap.* 19. *Tirinus in* 2. Chro.19.11. *Vbi nota diſtinctionem fori ſeu Magiſtratus Eccleſiaſtici & civilis, contra Anglo-Calviniſtas & noſtros Arminianos.*

The fourth Scripture which proves 1 an Eccleſiaſticall government and Sanhedrin, is 2 *Chro.* 19.8,10,11. where *Iehoſhaphat* reſtoreth the ſame Church government, which was firſt inſtituted by the hand of *Moſes*, and afterward ordered and ſetled by *David*. *Moreover* (ſaith the Text) *in Ieruſalem did Iehoſhaphat ſet of the Levites, and of the Prieſts, and of the chiefe of the Fathers of Iſrael, for the judgement of the Lord, and for controverſies, &c.* It is not controverted whether there was a civill Sanhedrin at *Ieruſalem*, but that which is to be proved from the place, is an Eccleſiaſticall Court, which I prove thus. Where there is a Court made up of Eccleſiaſticall members, judging Spirituall and Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, for a Spirituall and Eccleſiaſticall end, moderated by an Eccleſiaſticall preſident, having power ultimately and authoritatively to determine cauſes and con-

controverſies brought before them by appeale or reference from inferiour Courts; and whoſe ſentence is put in execution by Eccleſiaſticall officers; There it muſt needs be granted that there was a ſupream Eccleſiaſticall court, with power of Government. But ſuch a Court we finde at *Ieruſalem* in *Iehoſhaphats* time. *Ergo.* The Propoſition I ſuppoſe no man wil deny. For a Court ſo conſtituted, ſo qualified, and ſo authoriſed, is the very thing now in debate. And he that will grant us the thing which is in the aſſumption, ſhall have leave to call it by another name if he pleaſe. The aſſumption I prove by the parts. 1. Here are Levites and Prieſts in this Court, as members thereof, with power of deciſive ſuffrage, and with them ſuch of the chiefe of the Fathers of *Iſrael*, as were joyned in the government of that Church; Whence the Reverend and learned Aſſembly of Divines, and many Proteſtant Writers before them have drawn an argument for Ruling Elders. And this is one of the Scriptures alledged by our Divines againſt *Bellarmin*, to prove that others beſide thoſe who are commonly (but corruptly) called the Clergy ought to have a deciſive voyce in Synods.

2. Spirituall and Eccleſiaſticall cauſes were here judged: which are called by the name of *the judgement of the Lord*, V. 8. and *the matters of the Lord* diſtinguiſhed from *the Kings matters*, V. 11. ſo V. 10. beſide controverſies *between blood and blood*, that is, concerning conſanguinity and the interpreting of the Laws concerning forbidden degrees in marriage, (it being obſerved by interpreters that all the lawfull or unlawfull degrees are not particularly expreſſed, but ſome onely, and the reſt were to be judged of by parity of reaſon, and ſo it might fall within the cognizance of the Eccleſiaſticall Sanhedrin.) Though it may be alſo expounded otherwiſe, *between blood and blood*, that is, Whether the murther was wilfull or caſuall, (which was matter of fact) the cogniſance whereof belonged to the civill Judge; It is further added *between Law and Commandement, Statutes and Judgements*: noting ſeeming contradictions between one Law and another, (ſuch as *Manaſſeh Ben Iſrael* hath ſpoken of in his *Conciliator*) or when the ſence and meaning of the Law is controverted, (which is not matter of fact, but of right) wherein ſpeciall uſe was of the Prieſts whoſe lips ſhould preſerve know-

knowledge and the Law was to be sought at his mouth, *Mal.*2. 7. and that not onely ministerially and doctrinally, but judicially and in the Sanhedrin at *Ierusalem*, such controversies concerning the Law of God were brought before them, as in 2 *Chro.*19. the place now in hand. *Yea shall even warn them, &c.* Which being spoken to the Court, must be meant of a synedricall Decree, determining those questions and controversies concerning the Law, which should come before them. As for that distinction in the Text of *the Lords matters* and *the Kings matters*, *Erastus* page 274. saith that by the Lords matters is meant any cause expressed in the Law, which was to be judged. Whereby he takes away the distinction which the Text makes; for in his sence the Kings matters were the Lords matters. Which himselfe (it seems) perceiving, he immediately yeeldeth our interpretation, that by the Lords matters are meant things pertaining to the worship of God; and by the Kings matters, civill things. *Si per illas libet res ad cultum Dei spectantes, per hæc res civiles accipere, non pugnabo. If you please* (saith he) *by those, to understand things pertaining to the worship of God, by these, civill things, I will not be against it.*

3. It was for a Spirituall and Ecclesiasticall end, *ye shall even warne them that they trespasse not against the Lord.* Its not said *against one another*, but *against the Lord*, for two reasons. 1. Because mention had been made of the *Commandements, Statutes*, and *Judgements*, after the generall word *Law*, V. 10. by which names Interpreters use to understand (both in this and many other places of Scripture) the Lawes morall, Ceremoniall and Judiciall. Now the case to be judged might be part of the Ceremoniall Law, having reference to God and his Ordinances; and not part of the Judiciall law, or any injury done by a man to his neighbour. And in reference to the morall Law it might be a trespasse against the first Table, not against the second. 2. Even in the case of a personall or civill injury, or whatsoever the controversie was that was brought before them, they were to warn the Judges in the Cities not to trespasse against the Lord by mistaking or mis-understanding the Law, or by righting mens wrongs so as to wrong Divine right. And for that end they were to determine the *Jus*, and the

the intendment of the law, when it was controverted.

4. Whatsoever cause of their brethren that dwelt in the Cities, should come unto them, V. 10. (whether it should come by appeale, or by reference and arbitration) this Court at *Jerusalem* was to give out an ultimate and authoritative determination of it. So that what was brought from inferiour courts to them, is brought no higher to any other Court.

5. This Court had an Ecclesiasticall Prolocutor or moderator, V. 11. *Amariah the chiefe Priest is over you in all matters of the Lord:* Whereas *Zebadiah* the Ruler of the house of *Judah*, was Speaker in the civill Sanhedrin for all the Kings matters. *Amariah* and *Zebadiah* were not onely with the Sanhedrin, as members, or as Councellors, but *over* them as Presidents. *Eis summos Magistratus* (ἄρχοντας) *ex amicorum numero præposuit, Amasiam Sacerdotem, & ex Judæ tribu Zebadiam,* saith *Josephus antiq. l. 9. cap. 1. Erastus* confesseth pag. 273. that both of them were Presidents set over the Sanhedrin. and pag. 275. *Si Sacerdotem in Dei nomine, Zebadiam autem Regis præsedisse affirmetur, non refragabor.* He confesseth also, that the one was more especially to take care of the Lords matters, the other of the Kings matters. What then? He saith they were Presidents both of them to the whole Sanhedrin, not the one to one number, and the other to another. Yet in this he yeeldeth also p. 273. *Quanquam non peccet forte, qui Senatores hos per officia distributos dicat, ut alii magis hæc, alii magis illa negotia tractarint.* Whosoever denieth that that place proveth two distinct Courts, he may be convinced from this one reason, and I shall say to him in the words of *Bildad, Job* 8. 8. *Enquire I pray thee of the former age, and prepare thy selfe to the search of their fathers:* and in the Prophets words, *Jerem.* 2. 10. *Passe over the Isles of Chittim, and see, and send unto Kedar and consider diligently: and see if there be such a thing.* Where was it ever heard of, that a Priest was President of a Court, and that in sacred things and causes; that a civill Magistrate was president of a Court, and that in civill causes: and yet not two Courts, but one Court? If both Courts had materially consisted of the same members, of the same Priests, and of the same fathers of *Israel*, (which yet cannot be proved) this very diversification of the Presidents, and of the subject

matter, (if there were no more) will prove two Courts formally distinct. Even as now among our selves the same men may be members of two, or three, or foure, or more Courts, but the distinction of Presidents, and of the subject matter, maketh the Court distinct.

6. Here were also Ecclesiasticall Officers, vers. 11. *also the Levites shall be officers before you.* As before 1 *Chro.* 23. & 26. some of the Levites were *schophtim* Judges to give sentence, others *schoterim*, officers to see that sentence put in execution, and to cause those that were refractory to obey it, (so doe the Hebrews distinguish these two words) so it was here also, some of the Levites appointed to judge, V. 8. some to doe the part of Officers in point of execution of Ecclesiasticall censures, for they could not, nor might not compell men by the civill Sword. The same name is given to military Officers who prosecute the commands of authority, *Josh.* 1.10. And so much of this fourth.

The fifth place which I take to hold forth that distinction of Courts and Jurisdictions is *Jerem.* 26, where first the Prophet is taken into the Court of the Priests and Prophets, for which the Chaldee readeth *Scribes*, whose office it was to be Doctors of the law, and to resolve the difficult cases, and in that capacity they were members of Ecclesiasticall councels, *Matth.* 2.4. To the same sence saith *Diodati*, that the Prophets here spoken of, were such as were learned in the law, and had been bred in the Schooles and Colledges of the chiefe Prophets, *and in Ieremiahs time were present at Ecclesiasticall judgements and assemblies,* 2 *Kings* 23. 2. *as in Christs time the Scribes and Doctors of the Law used to be, who were somewhat like these Prophets. Menochius* and others expound it as the Chaldee doth. In this Court *Ieremiah* was examined and judged as a false Prophet, V. 8. 9. yet though they had judged him worthy to die, the Court of the Princes acquitteth him as a Prophet of the Lord, who had spoken to them in the name of the Lord, V. 10, 11, 16. That *Ieremiahs* cause was twice judged in two distinct Courts, and two different sentences upon it, hath been asserted by divers of the Erastian party to prove appeales from Ecclesiasticall to Civill courts: to which argument I have elsewhere spoken.

Onely

Onely I take here what they grant, that there were two Courts, and two sentences given, and so it was. The sentence of the Court of the Priests, (as themselves explaine it, V. 11.) was this, *This man is worthy to die*, or as the Hebrew hath it, *the judgement of death is for this man.* The Chaldee thus, *a sinne of the judgement of death is upon this man.* For (say they) he hath prophesied so and so; and he that speaketh against this City, and against this holy place is worthy to die. But the sentence of the Court of the Princes is V. 16. *This man is not worthy to die, for he hath spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God.* They doe not say to the Priests, Who did put any jurisdiction or authority to judge, in your hands? but they acquit him in point of fact, whom the Court of the Priests had condemned in point of right, as if they had said to the Priests, if *Jeremiah* were a false Prophet, you had reason to call for justice upon him even unto death: but your judgement hath runne upon a false supposition in point of fact, which we doe not finde proved, but know to be false. Wherefore from this place, these two things may appeare: 1. That the Court of the Priests had not power of capitall punishments; for if they had, certainly *Jeremiah* had been put to death, as *Hierom* noteth. 2. Yet they had a power to judge of a false Prophet, and judicially to pronounce him to be a false Prophet, and such a one as ought to be punished so and so, according to the Law. That they had such a power, appeareth, 1. from V. 8, 9. where they doe not take him to lead him to the Court of the Princes, and there to accuse him; but they take him, so as to give forth their owne sentence against him, as against a false Prophet, *Thou shalt surely die*, say they, *why hast thou prophesied in the name of the Lord, &c.* Why didst thou dare to pretend the name of God, as if God had sent thee to preach against the Temple and holy City? 2. *Jeremiah* doth not in all his differences alledge that the Priests and Scribes had not power to judge of a false Prophet, or to give sentence against one in such a case. Nor yet did the Princes object this, as hath been said; yet this had been as strong an exception as could have been made against the Priests, if they had assumed a power and authority of judgement, which was without their Sphere, and did not at all belong unto them.

3. If you compare the sentence of the Priests with the sentence of the Princes, the former is *in suo genere*, no lesse judiciall, authoritative, and peremptory, than the later: onely that was affirmative, this was negative. Finally, let us take for a conclusion of this Argument, that which Mr. *Prynne* himselfe in his fourth part of *The Soveraigne power of Parliaments and Kingdomes*, pag. 144. tels us out of *vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, with an approbatory and encomiastick close of his citation. *Jeremy being sent by God to denounce the overthrow of the City* Jerusalem, *is for this first condemned* (citing in the Margin *Jerem.* 26.) *by the Priests and Prophets, that is,* **by the Ecclesiasticall Judgement or Senate**: *after this by all the people, that is, by the ordinary Judges of the City, to wit, by the Captains of thousands and hundreds: at last by the Princes of Judah: that is, by 71 men sitting in the new porch of the Temple; his cause being made known, he is acquitted.*

The sixth place which intimateth an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, is *Jerem.* 18. 18. where the adversaries of *Jeremiah* say among themselves, *Come and let us devise devices against Jeremiah, for the Law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsell from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet. Come, and let us smite him with the tongue.* The force of their argument, (as not onely our Interpreters, but *Maldonat* also and *Sanctius*, following *Aquinas* and *Lyra*, tell us) stands in this, those who are of greatest authority in the Church, the Priests, Prophets, and Elders, with whom are the Oracles of truth, doe contradict *Jeremiah*, therefore he is a false Prophet. But what was the ground of this consequence? surely the ground was, that which *Bullinger* and the late English Annotations doe observe, namely, the Popish error was also their error, the Church cannot erre. But let us yet follow the argument to the bottome. How came they to thinke the Church cannot erre? or what was that Church which they thought infallible? No doubt they had respect to the Law of the Sanhedrin, *Deut.* 17. 10, 11, 12. *And thou shalt doe according to the sentence which they of that place (which the Lord shall choose) shall shew thee; and thou shalt observe to doe according to all that they enforme thee. According to the sentence of the Law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judge-*

judgement which they shall tell thee, thou shalt doe: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand, or to the left; And the man that will doe presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest (that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God) or unto the Judge, even that man shall die. From this Scripture misapplyed they drew an argument against *Jeremiah.* Wherein their meaning could not be this, that the doctrine of every individuall Priest, or of every individuall Scribe, is infallible, (for as the Law now cited did speak of the Sanhedrin, not of individuall Priests, so neither the Jewes of old, nor the Papists after them, have drawn the conceited infallibility so low, as to every particular Priest.) But they mean collectively, and point at an assembly or councell of Priests, Wise-men, and Prophets, which (as they apprehended) could not erre, and whose determination they preferred to the word of the Lord by *Jeremiah: for the Law* (that is, saith *Menochius*, the interpretation of the Law) *can not perish from the Priest, nor counsell from the wise.* Now this was an Ecclesiasticall, not a civill Sanhedrin, which may appeare thus: First, they doe not make mention of *the Judge* mentioned *Deut.* 17. (where *the Priest* & *the Judge* are distinguished) onely they mention *the Priest*, *the Prophet*, (for which the Chaldee hath *Scribe:* which is all one, as to the present argument, for we finde both Prophets and Scribes in Ecclesiasticall assemblies, as was said before) and *the wise.* By *the wise* are meant those that were chiefe or did excell among the Scribes or Doctors of the Law. So *Grotius* annot. in *Matth.* 23.34. and it may be collected from *Jerem.* 8.8,9. This is certaine, that these *wise men* were Church-officers; for as they are distinguished from the Judges, *Esay* 3.2. so Jesus Christ speaking of Apostles, and other Ministers of the Gospel, whom he was to send forth, expresseth himselfe by way of allusion to the Ecclesiasticall Ministers of the Jewes. *Matth.* 23.34. *Behold I send unto you Prophets, and Wise men, and Scribes,* which *Luke* ch. 11.v.49. hath thus, *I will send them Prophets and Apostles.* Secondly, the civill Sanhedrin at this time did (so far as we can finde) contradict *Jeremiah*; but when his cause came afterward before them, *Ierem.* 26. they shew much favour and friendship to him. Thirdly, that which is added,

cont.

come and let us him ſmite with the tongue: may be three waies read, and every way it ſuteth to the Eccleſiaſticall Sanhedrin (whether themſelves be the ſpeakers in the Text, or whether the people be the ſpeakers of it, as of that which they would deſire and move the Sanhedrin to doe in the name of them all) either thus: *Let us ſmite him for the tongue*, that is for an Eccleſiaſticall cauſe, for falſe Doctrine. Or thus, *Let us ſmite him in the tongue* (ſo the Septuagint, and *Arias Montanus*) that is, Let us ſmite him with an Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, and ſilence him, and diſcharge him to preach any more to the people. Or thus, *Let us ſmite him with the tongue*, that is, with an Eccleſiaſticall ſentence or declaration, ſmite him not with the Sword (which belonged onely to the civill Magiſtrate) but with the tongue, by declaring him to be a falſe Prophet, and by determining the caſe *de jure*, what ought to be done with him according to the Law.

Seventhly, conſider another place, *Ezech.* 7.26. *Then ſhall they ſeek a viſion of the Prophet: but the Law ſhall periſh from the Prieſt, and counſell from the ancients.* Here againe, theſe are to be lookt upon collectively and conjunctly, (not diſtributively and ſeverally) and this I prove from the Text it ſelfe, not onely becauſe the counſell here ſought for, was not to be given by one ancient, but by *the ancients*, yea it was a principall part of the curſe or judgement, that counſell could not be had from an aſſembly of ancients or Elders, ſuppoſe it might be had from ſome individuall Elders here or there:) but alſo becauſe the *Antitheſis* in the Text intimateth a diſappointment in that thing which was ſought after. They ſhall ſeeke *a viſion from the Prophet*, or (as the Chaldee hath it) *diſcipline from the Scribe*. This they ſhall not finde, and why? becauſe the Law ſhall periſh from the Prieſt, and counſell from the Ancients. It was therefore Conſiſtoriall or Synedricall counſell, Judgement, or Diſcipline, which ſhould be ſought, but ſhould not be found. So that though a Prophet of the Lord ſhall peradventure be found, who can reveale the councell of the Lord, in a time of generall defection, like *Micaiah* contradicting the 400 Prophets, yet an Eccleſiaſticall counſell of Prophets, Scribes, Prieſts, and Elders, ſometime *Iſraels* glory, ſhall turn to be *Iſraels* ſhame,

and

and that assembly which did sometime *respondere de jure*, and pronounce righteous judgement, and give light in difficult cases, shall doe so no more: the very light of *Israel* shall be darkenesse; the law and counsell shall perish from them; that is, they shall not finde councell, nor the understanding of the law, saith *Sanctius*. *Polanus* upon the place draweth an Argument against the infallibility of counsels, because the law and counsell did perish not onely (saith he) from the Priests here and there in the Cities, but also from the high Priest, and the other Priests and Elders, who were together at *Jerusalem*. If this Text be rightly applied by him (and so it is by other Protestant Writers) to prove against Papists that Councels may erre, then here was an Ecclesiasticall councell.

Eightly, even without *Ierusalem* and *Juda* there was a Senate or assembly of Elders, which did assist the Prophets in overseeing the manners of the people, censuring sin, and deliberating of the common affairs of the Church. This *C. Bertramus de polit. Iud. c.* 16 collecteth from 2 *Kings* 6.32. *But Elisha sate in his house, and the Elders sate with him.* I know some think that those Elders were the Magistrates of *Samaria*, but this I cannot admit, for two reasons. 1. Because *Iosephus Antiq. lib.* 9. *cap.* 2. cals them *Elisaes* disciples: and from him *Hugo Cardinalis*, *Carthusianus*, and others doe so expound the Text. They are called *Elisas* Disciples, as the Apostles were Christs Disciples, by way of Excellency and eminency: all the disciples or sonnes of the Prophets were not properly Elders, but those onely who were assumed into the Assembly of Elders, or called to have a share in the mannaging of the common affaires of the Church. 2. *Cajetan* upon the place gives this reason from the Text it selfe, to prove that these Elders were spirituall men (as he speaketh) because *Elisha* asketh them, *See ye how this sonne of a murderer hath sent to take away my head?* What expectation could there be, that they did see a thing, then secret and unheard of, unlesse they had been men familiar with God? Now these Elders were sitting close with *Elisha* in his house. It was not a publike or Church assembly for worship, but for counsell, deliberation, and resolution, in some case of difficulty and publike concernment. So *Tostatus* and *Sanctius* on the place. A parallell

lell place there is, *Ezech.* 8.1. *I sate in mine house, and the Elders of Iudah sate before me.* Whether those Elders came to know what God had revealed to the Prophet, concerning the state of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*, as *Lavater* upon the place supposeth, or for deliberation about some other thing, it is nothing like a civill Court, but very like an Ecclesiasticall senate. Now if such there was out of *Ierusalem*, how much more in *Ierusalem*, where (as there came greater store of Ecclesiasticall causes and controversies concerning the sence of the Law, to be judged, so) there was greater store of Ecclesiastical persons fit for government? whatsoever of this kind we finde elsewhere, was but a *Transsumpt*, the *Archetype* was in *Ierusalem.*

Ninthly, that place *Zech.* 7. 1,2,3. helpeth me much. The Jews sent Commissioners unto the Temple, there *to speake unto the Priests which were in the house of the Lord of Hosts, and to the Prophets* (the Chaldee hath *and to the Scribes*) *saying, Should I weepe in the first moneth, &c.* Here is an Ecclesiasticall assembly, which had authority to determine controversies concerning the worship of God. *Grotius* upon the place distinguisheth these Priests and Prophets from the civill Sanhedrin, yet he saith they were to be consulted with, in controverted cases, according to the Law, *Deut.* 17.9. If so, then their sentence was authoritative and binding, so far that the man who did presumptuously disobey them, was to die the death, *Deut.* 17.12.

Tenthly, let it be considered what is that *Moshav Zekenim consessus* or *Cathedra seniorum*, *Psal.* 107.32. (for though every argument be not an infallible demonstration, yet *cuncta juvant*) *let them exalt him also in the Congregation (or Church) of the people, and praise him in the Assembly of the Elders.* Compare this Text with *Psalm* 115.9, 10,11. as likewise with *Psalm* 118.2, 3,4. In all the three Texts, there are three sorts of persons distinguished, and more especially called upon to glorifie God. *Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodnesse*, saith the Text in hand, *Psalm* 107.31. for that you have in the other two places, *Ye that feare the Lord, &c.* for *the congregation of the people*, you have in the other two places *Israel*, and *the house of Israel.* For *the Assembly of the Elders*, you have in the other Texts, *the house of Aaron.* I will not here build any thing upon the obser-

observation of *Hugo Cardinalis* on *Psalm* 107.32. that the congregation of the Princes is not mentioned in this businesse, because *not many mighty, not many noble, &c.* One thing I am sure of, there were Elders in *Israel*, clearly distinct both from the Princes, Judges, and civill Magistrates, *Jos.* 23. 2. 2 *Kings* 10. 1. *Ezra* 10. 14. *Acts* 4. 5. and elsewhere. And the parallel Texts afore cited, doe couple together these *Elders* and *the house of Aaron*, as Pastors and ruling Elders now are; and as the Priests and Elders are found conjoyned elsewhere in the old Testament, *Exod.* 24. 1. *Deut.* 27. 1. with vers. 9. *Ezech.* 7. 26. *Jer.* 19. 1. So *Matth.* 26. 59. The work also of giving thanks for mercies and deliverances obtained by the afflicted and such as have been in distresse (the purpose which the Psalmist hath in hand, extended also to the deliverances of particular persons.) is more especially commended to those who are assembled in an Ecclesiasticall capacity. Even as now among our selves, the civill Courts of Justice, or Magistrates and Rulers or Judges assembled by themselves in a politick capacity, use not to be desired to give thanks for the delivery of certain persons from a danger at Sea, or the like. But it were very proper and fit to desire thanks to be returned, 1. by those that feare God; for as we should desire the prayers, so likewise the praises of the Saints. 2. By the Church or Congregation, of which they that have received the mercy are members. 3. By the Eldership, yea (if there be occasion) by a Synod of Elders, who as they ought to watch over the City of God, and to stand upon their watch-tower for observing approaching dangers; so they ought to take speciall notice of exemplary mercies, bestowed upon the afflicted members of the Church, and be an ensample to the flocke, in giving thanks, as well as in other holy duties.

The eleventh place, which seemeth to hold forth unto us an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, is *Ezech.* 13. 9. where its said of the Prophets that did see vanity, and Divine lies: *they shall not be in the assembly of my people, neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel, neither shall they inter into the Land of Israel.* Where (as *Diodati* and *Grotius* observe,) the speech riseth by degrees. 1. they shall not any more be admitted into the assembly or councell to have any voice there, as Prophets in those

daies had saith *Diodati* citing *Jer.*26.7. Secondly, they shall not so much as come into the computation or numbring of the people as members of the Church of *Israel.* 3. Nay they shall not be permitted to dwell in the holy Land, or to returne thither from their captivity; they shall not have so much favour as strangers had, who might come into the holy Land and sojourne there.

In the first branch, the word translated assembly is סוד *sod* which properly signifieth *a secret*, and is used for *counsell* (because *counsell* ought to be *secret*) or for the *place of counsell*, or *assembly of Counsellers. Pagnin* in his *Thesaurus* p.1761. readeth this place with *Hierome*, *in consilio*, or otherwise saith he, *in concilio. Vatablus: in concilio populi mei non erunt.* The Septuagints read ἐν παιδεία τῶ λαῶ μου: that is, those Prophets shall have no hand *in the Discipline of my people.* The same word they render in other places by βυλὴ, and σωέδειον, yea by both these put together, *Prov.*20.19. where for the Hebrew *sod*, the Septuagints have βυλὰς ἐν σωεδείω. *He that revealeth the secret counsels in the Sanhedrin*; and it cohereth well with the preceding Verse, where they mention κυβερνήσεις, *Governments.* Sometime they expound the word by an Episcopall (I mean not Prelaticall) inspection *Job* 29.4. Θεὸς ἐπισκοπῶ ἐποιεῖτο τῶ ὄικω μου. *God was an overseer of my house.* So that, so far as the Septuagints authority can weigh, that place *Ezek.*13.9. must be understood of the secluding of those Prophets from the Sanhedrin, not from the Civill (in which the Prophets were not members) but from the Eccleſiasticall Sanhedrin.

[m] *Magdeb Gent. 1. lib.1. cap 6. Seniores populi videntur fuisse aliquot è populo lecti viri, ætate, doctrina, & vitæ probitate spectati, qui simul cum Ecclesiastica personâ, Templi, Judiciorum & aliarum rerum quæ ad Ecclesiæ gubernationem pertinebant, curam habuerunt.*

In the twelfth and last place, the new Testament holds out to us an Eccleſiasticall Sanhedrin: Whether the civill Sanhedrin was wholy taken away by *Herod*, and another civill Sanhedrin not substitute in the place of that which he took away, but the Eccleſiasticall Sanhedrin onely remaining, as some hold; or whether both did then continue though not so clearely distinct, as others hold: This we finde that there was an Eccleſiasticall government in the hands of Church-officers; for 1. there was a councell of the Priests and Elders and Scribes *Matth.*2.4. & 16.21. & 21.23. & 26.57,59. & 27.1.12. *Marke* 14.43. *Luke* 22.66. *Acts* 4.5. [m] The Centuriſts say that those Elders

Elders were joyned with the Priests in the government of the Church, with Ecclesiasticall persons in Ecclesiasticall affaires. Which hath been rightly taken for a president of our ruling Elders. 2. That Councell is called πρεσβυτέριον *Luke* 22.66. *Acts* 22.5. the Presbytery or Eldership: the very name which *Paul* gives to that assembly of Church-officers, who ordained *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.*4.14. is it credible that the Apostle would transfer the name of a civill Court to signifie an Assembly, which was meerely Ecclesiasticall and not Civill? The very use of the word in this sence by the Apostle, tels us that in his age the word πρεσβυτέριον was taken in an Ecclesiasticall notion onely. 3. This Councell did examine *Jesus* concerning his Disciples and his doctrine, and received witnesses against him, and pronounced him guilty of blasphemy, *Matth.*27.57. *Marke* 14.53, 55. *Joh.* 18.19. Hence Protestant writers draw an argument against Papists, to overthrow their infallibility of Councels: unto which argument *Bellarmine* deviseth foure answers. But it came not once into his thoughts, to reply that this councell was civill, not Ecclesiasticall, which had been his best answer, if any probability for it. It hath been supposed, both by Protestant, and Popish Writers, that it was an Ecclesiasticall Councell, such as the controversie is about: otherwise our Argument had been as impertinent, as their answer was insufficient. 4. Our opposites have no evasion here, but that which *Bilson*, *Saravia*, and others of the Prelaticall party did answer in opposition to ruling Elders; namely, that the Jewish Elders were Judges or Magistrates; But the reply which served then, will serve now: the Elders are plainly distinguished from Judges, Rulers, and Princes, *Jos.* 8.33. & 23.2. *Deut.* 5.23. *Iud.* 8.14. 2 *Kings* 10.1,5. *Ezra* 10 14. *Acts* 4.5. *Tostatus* on *Deut.* 21.2. & 22.15, 16. observeth the same distinction of Judges and Elders. *Pelargus* on *Deut.*21.2,3,4. observeth the like. That which I say concerning the distinction of Judges and Elders may be confirmed by *Halichoth Olam Tract.*1. *cap.* 3. *The Iudges of Soura, M. Houna, and D. Isaac. The Judges of Phounbeditha M. Papa the sonne of Samuel, &c. The Elders of Soura M. Houna and M. Hisda. The Elders of Phounbeditha Ena and Abimi the sonne of Rabba.* And thus we are taught how to

understand these Gemarick phrases, of the Judges of such a place, and the Elders of such a place, that we may not mistake them as if they were one. 5. Some have also drawne a patterne for the constitution of Synods, from that Councell, *Acts* 4. 5, 6. where we finde assembled together Rulers, Priests, Elders, Scribes, according to which patterne we have in our Synods, 1. the civill Magistrate to preside in the order of proceedings, for preventing tumults, injuries, disorders, and to assist and protect the Synod. 2. Pastors of Churches. 3. Doctors from universities, answering to the Scribes or Doctors of the *Law*. 4. Ruling Elders who assist in the Government of the Church. 6. After that *Iudæa* was redacted into a Province, and the *Romans* having keptin their owne hands, not only the power of life and death *Iohn* 18.31. but all judgement in whatsovever civill, or criminall offences, falling out among the Jews, meant by *matters of wrong or wicked leudnesse*, *Acts* 18.14. And having left to the Jewes no government, nor any power of judgement, except in things pertaining to their religion onely *Ib.* verse 15. These six things considered, it is very unprobable (if not unpossible) that the Councell of the Priests, Elders, and Scribes, mentioned so often in the New Testament, should be no Ecclesiasticall Court, but a temporall and civill Magistracy. The Centurists *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 10. reckon that Councell for an Ecclesiasticall Court, distinct from civill Magistracy: and they propose these two to be distinctly treated of, *Acta coram Pontificibus seu Magistratu Ecclesiastico*, (and here they bring in the councell of the Priests, Elders, and Scribes,) And *Actio coram Pilato seu magistratu politico.*

I know *Erastus lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. aud *lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. though he confesse plainly that the Jewish Sanhedrin mentioned in the Gospell, and in the Acts of the Apostles, had onely power of judging causes belonging to Religion, and that the *Romans* did leave them no power to judge of civill injuries; yet he holdeth, that in these causes of Religion, the Sanhedrin had power not onely of imprisoning, and scourging, but even of death it selfe. And so endeavours to make it a temporall or civil Magistracy, (which Mr *Prynne* also doth *vindic.* page 45. yet he speaketh dubiously of their power of capitall punishments.)

But

But this is confuted by the reasons which I have given. Whereunto I further adde these few animadversions.

1. The strongest proofe which *Erastus* brings out of *Josephus antiq. lib.* 20. *cap.* 8. which (as he alledgeth) puts the thing out of all controversie, is a very weake and insufficient proof. *Josephus* tels us in the close of that Chapter, that after the death of *Herod* and *Archelaus*, this was the Jewish Government, ἀριστοκρατία μὲν ἦν ἡ πολιτεία· ἔστι δ' ὑφ' ἑαυτῇ τὸ ἔθνος οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πιστεύοντο. This he citeth page 177. and page 178. to prove that the Sanhedrin in Christs time, was a civill Magistracy, having power of the Sword. But I may with a great deale more probability argue contrariwise from these words. *Josephus* tels us the Constitution and forme of the Jewish policy or Government was at that time Aristocraticall, but it was an Ecclesiasticall Aristocracy, the government was in the hands of the chiefe Priests. Or thus (if you will) the Jewes at that time had a bare name of an aristocracy; they had their ἄρχοντες *Optimates, Primates*, or *Rulers*: but it was *titulo tenus*, all power of civill government being taken from them by the *Romans*, and the government that was, was Ecclesiasticall. That very Chapter gives us a better argument to prove, that the *Romans* did not permit to the Jewes capitall Judgements: for *Josephus* there records that *Ananus* the high Priest taking the opportunity after the death of *Festus*, while *Albinus* the Successour of *Festus*, was but yet on his journey toward *Iudea*, did call a Councell of Judges (καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν) before whom he presented *James* the brother of Christ, and some others, who were (as guilty of impiety) condemned to be stoned. Which mightily displeased all such as did observe the Laws. *Albinus* at that time comming from *Alexandria*, being enformed of the thing, and that it was not lawfull for *Ananus* to doe any such thing, without the *Roman* Governour, wrote a chiding and threatning letter to *Ananus*. And further, the thing being secretly signified by some to King *Agrippa*, who did also beseech the King to command *Ananus* to doe no such thing againe, he having trespassed in this. Whereupon *Agrippa* was so highly offended, that he tooke away from *Ananus* the high Priests place, and gaue it to *Iesus* the sonne of *Damneus*.

2. Where-

2. Whereas *Erastus* argueth from the imprisoning, beating, or scourging, yea taking counsell to kill the Apostles *Acts* 4, & 5. the stoning of *Steven Acts* 7. *Pauls* letters from the high Priest, for biuding and bringing to *Jerusalem* the Disciples of the Lord Acts 9.1,2. also the imprisoning and condemning to death the Saints Acts 26.10. Unto all this I answer out of [n]*Iosephus*, that in that degenerate age the high Priests and such as adhered to them, did use a great deale of violence, whereby they did many things for which they had no just nor lawfull power. So that the Letters and Warrants given out to *Saul*, and the execution of the same by a cruell and bloody persecuting of the Saints, can not prove the ἐξουσία the power and authority which was allowed to the Sanhedrin, but onely the δυνάμις the present prevalent power of the high Priest and his faction in that confusion of affaires; and their extreame malice against the Saints, to have been such as made them to doe things for which they had no legall power nor warrant. And this one Animadversion breakes all the strength of Mr *Prynnes* argument *vindic.* page 5. that the Councell of the Jewes *had power (which no meere Ecclesiasticall consistory can doe) to scourge, imprison, torture, and out-law offenders, if not to condemne, put to death.* (Where he citeth divers Texts, none of which proveth either torturing, or out-lawing, and the most of which, prove not so much as that the Councell of the Jewes at that time had authority to scourge or imprison, as *Matth.* 5.22. & 10.17. *Mark* 13.9. *Acts* 6.12,13,14. & 24.20. & 25.15.) The imprisonment of the Apostles was not without the authority of the Captaine of the Temple Acts 4.1,3. This captaine of the Temple, is thought by the best interpreters, to have been the Captaine of the Garrison which the *Romans* placed in the castle *Antonia* hard by the Temple, and that to prevent tumults and uproares when the people came to the Temple, especially at the solemne feasts in great multitudes. But that the Captaine of the Temple was a civill Magistrate of the Jewes, or one deputed with authority and power from the Sanhedrin, will never be proved. When the Councell thought of slaying the Apostles *Acts* 5.33. it was in a sudden passion, being *cut to the heart* at that which they heard. But *Gamaliel* tels them

Verse

[n] *Antiq. Jud. lib. 20. cap 6. Ipsi summi pontifices discedere cæperunt à Sacerdotibus & primatibus Hierosolymitanorum civium, singulæque incedebant stipati manu audacissimorum & seditiosorum hominum, conflictareque inter se mutuis certabant convitiis & lapidationibus: nec erat qui compesceret, quasi vacante urbe Magistratibus. In tantum autem exarsit summorum pontificum impudentia, ut auderent servos suos in areas mittere, qui auferrent debitas Sacerdotibus decimas, aliquòrque pauperiores è Sacerdotum ordine alimentorum inopia fame deficerent. Tantò plus tum pollebat violentia seditiosorum quam justitia.*

Verse 35. *Ye men of Israel take heed to your selves* ἐαυτοῖς warning them as Interpreters take it, of their own danger, from the *Romans*, if they should put any one to death. The putting of *Steven* to death was upon pretence of *Judicium zeli*, or *Jus zelotarum*, as *Grotius* thinks *de Jure belli ac pacis lib.2.cap* 20. *sect.9.* If so, it was an extraordinary act. I am sure it was done most tumultuously, disorderly and furiously, before either himselfe was heard speake out, or any sentence was given against him, as is manifest *Acts* 7.54,57,58.

3. *Erastus* his glosse upon *Iohn* 18.31. *It is not lawfull for us to put any man to death*, meaning (saith he) for making himselfe a King against *Cæsar*, the cause for which they did chiefly accuse him to *Pilate*. So likewise Bishop *Bilson* (a great follower of *Erastus*) of the perpetuall government of Christs Church cap.4. But marke the words, *Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him and judge him according to your Law; The Iewes therefore said unto him, It is not lawfull for us to put any man to death. Pilate* durst not have refused to judge a man who made himselfe a King against *Cæsar*, nor durst he have put it over upon the Jewes to have judged one in that which concerned *Cæsars* crowne. Nay, as soone as the Jewes objected, *If thou let this man goe, thou art not Cæsars friend; for whosoever maketh himselfe a King, speaketh against Cæsar. Pilate* when he heard that, went in againe, and sate down on the Judgement seat *Iohn* 19.12.13. Therefore when *Pilate* said to the Jewes *take ye him, and judge him according to your law*, he spake it of matters of their Law. The Councell of the chiefe Priests, Elders and Scribes had given sentence against Christ *de jure*, that he was guilty of blasphemy, and thereupon (not having power to put any man to death) they led him to *Pilate*, *Matth.* 26.65,66. with *Matth.* 27.1,2. *Marke* 14.63,64. with *Marke* 15.1. *Luke* 22.71. with *Luke* 23.1. *Pilate* unwilling to meddle against Christ, waves the businesse in the Judgement-hall, I perceive (would he say) that this man is accused of such things as concerne your Law and your Religion; therefore take him and judge him according to your Law. They reply, in reference to that which *Pilate* did drive at, *It is not lawfull for us to put any man to death.* If they had meant, for causes which concerned *Cæsars* Crown, it had been not

onely

onely an impertinent reply, but a yeelding to *Pilates* intention; for he might have said, I doe not meane, that ye shall judge him for that which concerneth *Cæsar*, but for that which concerneth your owne Law and Religion. Therefore certainely the answer which the Jewes made to *Pilate*, did reply, that though they had power to judge a man in that which concerned their Law and Religion, yet they had no power to put any man to death, no not for that which concerned their Law.

4. There are severall passages in the story of *Paul* which shew us, that though the Jewish Sanhedrin might judge a man in matters of their Law, yet they were accusers, not Judges, in civill or capitall punishments, I meane when a man was accused as worthy of bonds or of death, though it were for a matter of their Law, they had no liberty to judge, but onely to accuse. The Jewes drew *Paul* before the judgement seat of *Gallio*, even for a matter of their law. This fellow (say they to *Gallio*) perswadeth men to worship God, contrary to the Law *Acts* 18.13. If they had intended onely an Ecclesiasticall censure, their recourse had been either to the Sanhedrin, or at least to the Synagogue, but because they intended a corporall temporall punishment, which neither the Sanhedrin nor the Synagogue had power to inflict, therefore they must prosecute *Paul* before *Gallio*; whose answer was to this purpose, that if it had been a *matter of wrong or wicked leudnesse*, it had been proper for him to have judged it, but that since it was no such thing, he would not meddle in it, knowing also, that the Jewes had no power to doe it by themselves. Againe, *Acts* 23. 28, 29. *Claudius Lysias* writeth to *Felix* concerning *Paul* thus, *and when I would have knowne the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their Councell. Whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their Law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds.* That which made *Lysias* interpose in the businesse, and rescue *Paul* from the hands of the Jewes, was the Jewes designe to put *Paul* to death, under colour of judging him according to their Law (which was the pretence made by *Tertullus Acts* 24.6.) Now in that which was to be punished, either by death, or so much as by bonds, *Lysias* conceives the Jewes to be no

no competent Judges, therefore he brings *Paul* into the councell of the Jewes, not to be judged by them, but to know what accusation they had against him. For the same reason *Paul* himselfe did decline going to *Jerusalem*, to be judged there, no not of matters concerning the Religion and Law of the Jewes, that accusation being so far driven on, as to make him worthy of death. His accusers (saith *Festus* to King *Agrippa*) *brought none accusation of such things as I supposed, but had certaine questions against him of their owne superstition, and of one Iesus which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And because I doubted of such manner of questions. I asked him whether he would goe to Ieruselem, and there be judged of these matters, Acts* 25. 18 19,20. This *Paul* had declined vers. 10. *I stand at Cæsars judgement seat* (saith he) *where I ought to be judged.* And why? but because his accusation was capitall, even in that which concerned the Law of the Jewes; and he knew the Jewes at that time had no power of capitall judgements. Some have alledged this example of *Paul* for appeales from Presbyteries or Synods to the civill Magistrate: by which argument themselves grant that the Jewish Sanhedrin then declined by *Paul*, was a Ecclesiasticall, not a civill Court.

5. Besides all this *Erastus* his opinion is strongly confuted by that which *Constantinus L'Empereur Annot. in remp. Jud.* pag. 404. to 407. proving that the Jewes after the thirtieth yeere of Christ, had no power of punishing with death; for proofe hereof citeth a passage of *Aboda zara*, that forty yeers before the destruction of the Temple, the Sanhedrin (which had in former times exercised capitall judgements) did remove from *Hierusalem*, *quum viderent se non posse judicia capitalia exercere*, when they perceived that they could not exercise capitall judgements, they said *let us remove out of this place, lest we be guilty:* it being said *Deut.* 17.10. *according to the sentence which they of that place shall shew thee:* whence they collected, that if they were not in that place, they were not obliged to capitall judgements: and so they removed. And if you would know whether he tels us out of *Rosch Haschana*, they removed from *Hierusalem* to *Jabna*, thence to *Ousa* thence to *Schaphrea*, &c. He that desires to have further proofes for that which hath been said, may

read *Buxtorf. lexic. Chald. Talmud. & rabbin.* pag. 514, 515. He proves that *Judicia criminalia*, criminall judgements did cease, and were taken away from the Jewes forty yeeres before the destruction of the second Temple. This he saith is plaine in *Talmud Hierosol. in lib. Sanhedrin cap.* 7. in *Talmud Babyl. in Sanhedrin fol.* 41. 1. in *Aboda zara fol.* 8. 2. in *Schab. fol.* 15. 1. in *Juchasin fol.* 51. 1. *Majemon.* in *Sanhedrin cap.* 14. *sect.* 13. He cites also a passage in *Berachos fol.* 58. 1. concerning one who for a hainous crime even for lying with a beast ought to be adjudged to death; but when one said that he ought to die, it was answered, that they had no power to put any man to death. And this saith Dr. *Buxtorf* is the very same, which the Jewes said to *Pilate John* 18. 31. Now this power being taken from the Jewes forty yeeres before the destruction of the Temple and City, which was in the 71 yeere of Christ, his death being in the 34. Hence he proveth that this power was taken from the Jewes neere three yeeres before the death of Christ. And I further make this inference, that since the Sanhedrin which had power of life and death, did remove from *Hierusalem* forty yeers before the destruction of the Temple (for which see also *Tzemach David. edit. Hen. Vorst.* pag. 89. and so about three yeeres before the death of Christ; it must needs follow that the Councell of the Priests, Elders, and Scribes, mentioned so often in, and before Christs passion, was not a civill Magistracy, nor the civill Sanhedrin, but an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin. Whence also it follows, that the Church *Matth.* 18. 17. unto which Christ directs his Disciples to goe with their complaints, was not the civill Court of Justice among the Jewes, (as Mr *Prynne* takes it) for that civill Court of Justice had then removed from *Hierusalem*, and had lost its authority in executing Justice, *J. Coch annot. in Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin. cap.* 1. *sect.* 13. beareth witnesse to the same story above mentioned, that forty yeeres before the destruction of the Temple, the Sanhedrin did remove from its proper seat (where he also mentions the ten stations or degrees of their removing) and *Iam tum cessarunt judicia capitalia*, saith he. *Now at that time the capitall judgements did cease.* Thus we have three witnesses singularly learned in the Jewish Antiquities. Unto these adde *Casaubon*

exerc.

exerc. 16. *anno* 34. *num.* 76. He holds that though the Councell of the Jewes had cognizance of the offence (for otherwise how could they give a reason or cause when they demanded justice) in which respect the Councell did judge Christ to be guilty of death, *Marke* 14. 64. yet their Councell had then no more power of capitall punishments, which saith he, the more learned moderne writers doe demonstrate è *Juchasin*, and from other Talmudicall writings; he addeth that this power of putting any man to death was taken from the Jewes some space before this time when they said to *Pilate*, *It is not lawfull for us to put any man to death*: for this power was taken from them, saith he, forty yeeres before the destruction of the second Temple, as the Rabbinicall writers doe record.

I have thus largely prosecuted my last argument, drawn from the New Testament, mentioning the Councell of the Priests, Elders, and Scribes.

And I trust the twelve arguments which have been brought may give good satisfaction toward the proofe of an Ecclesiasticall Jewish Sanhedrin.

The chiefe objection which ever I heard or read against this distinction of a Civill Sanhedrin and an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jewes, is this. That neither the Talmud nor the Talmudicall writers mention any such distinction, but speake onely of one supreme Sanhedrin of 71, and of other two Courts, which sate the one at the doore of the Court before the Temple, the other at the gate which entereth to the mountaine of the Temple. There were also Courts in the Cities where capitall cases were judged by three and twenty, pecuniall mults by three.

Answ. It must be remembred that not onely the Talmudicall Commentators, but the Talmud it selfe, is much later than the time of the Sanhedrin, and the integrity of the Jewish government. Yea later (by some Centuries) than the destruction of the Temple and City of *Jerusalem*. So that the Objection which is made is no stronger than as if one should argue thus, There is no mention of Elderships constituted of Pastors and Ruling Elders (without any Bishop having preeminence over the rest) neither in the Canon Law, nor decretals of Popes,

nor in the Booke of the Canons of the *Roman* Church. Therefore when *Paul* wrote his Epistle to the Church of *Rome*, there was no such Eldership in that Church, constituted as hath been said. But if the Ecclesiasticall Government either of the Church of *Rome*, or of the Church of the Jewes can be proved from Scripture (as both may) it ought to be no prejudice against those truths, that they are not found in the Writers of after-times, and declining ages. Howbeit there may be seen some footsteps of a Civill and Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, even in the Talmudicall writers, in the opinion of *Constantinus L' Empereur*, and in that other passage cited by D. *Buxtorf* out of *Elias*. Of which before. And so much concerning an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jewes.

If after all this, any man shall be unsatisfied in this particular, yet in the issue, such as are not convinced that there was an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin among the Jewes, distinct from their civill Sanhedrin, may nevertheless be convinced not by the former arguments, but by other *Mediums*, that there was an Ecclesiasticall government among the Jewes distinct from their civill government. For it belonged to the Priests, (not to the Magistrates or Judges) to *put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and cleane.* And the Priests (not the Magistrates) are challenged for not putting difference between the holy and prophane *Ezech.*22.26. And this power of the Priests was not meerly doctrinall or declarative, but decisive, binding, and juridicall, so farre as that according to their sentence men were to be admitted as cleane, or excluded as uncleane. Yea in other cases, as namely in trying and judging the scandall of a secret and unknown murther, observe what is said of the Priests, *Deut.* 21.5. *by their word shall every controversie and every stroke be tried.* Yea themselves were Judges of controversies *Ezech.*44.24. *And in controversie they shall stand in judgement, and they shall judge it according to my judgements.* Where the Ministers of the Gospell are principally intended, but not without an allusion unto and parallel with the Priests of the old Testament, in this point of jurisdiction. Suppose now it were appointed by Law, that Ministers shall separate or put difference between the holy and prophane, that by their word

word every controverſie concerning the cauſes of ſuſpenſion or ſequeſtration of men from the Sacrament, ſhall be tried; that in controverſie they ſhall ſtand in judgement, and judge according to the word of God: Would not every one looke upon this, as a power of government put into the hands of Miniſters. And none readier to aggravate ſuch government, then the Eraſtians. Yet all this amounts to no more, then by the plaine and undeniable Scriptures above cited, was committed to the Prieſts. Suppoſe alſo, that men were kept backe from the Temple and from the Paſſeover, not for any morall uncleanneſſe, but for ceremoniall uncleanneſſe onely (which is to be afterwards diſcuſſed) yet the Prieſts their judging and deciding of controverſies concerning mens legall uncleanneſſe, according to which judgement and deciſion, men were to be admitted to, or kept backe from the Temple and Paſſover (yea ſometime their owne houſes, as in the caſe of leproſie) could not chooſe but entitle them to a power of government, which power was peculiar to them; and is not in all the old Teſtament aſcribed to Magiſtrates or Judges. And as the exerciſe of this power did not agree to the Magiſtrate, ſo the commiſſion, charge, and power given to thoſe who did keepe backe the uncleane, was not derived from the Magiſtrate; for it did belong to the intrinſecall ſacerdotall authority 2 *Kings* 11. 18. *The Prieſt (Jehojada) appoined Officers over the houſe of the Lord.* The 70 thus, καὶ κατέστησεν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου. Theſe Officers or overſeers over the Temple, were appointed by *Jehojada*, for keeping backe the uncleane, as *Grotius* upon the place, following *Joſephus*, hath obſerved. Compare 2 *Chro.* 23. 19. *And he (Jehojada) ſet the Porters at the gates of the houſe of the Lord, that none which was uncleane in any thing ſhould enter in.* For the ſame end did he appoint theſe overſeers over the Temple, 2 *Kings* 11. It was alſo appointed by the Law, that the man who ſhould doe any thing preſumptuouſly, contrary to the ſentence of the Prieſts, ſhould die the death, as well as the man who ſhould doe any thing preſumptuouſly, contrary to the ſentence of the Judge, *Deut.* 17. 9, 12.

Finally, the high Prieſt was a ruler of the people, and to him is that law applied, *Thou ſhalt not ſpeake evill of the Rulers of thy people.*

people Acts 23.5. Which is not meant onely in regard that he was president of the Sanhedrin; for there was an Ecclesiasticall ruling power, which was common with him to some other Priests, 2 *Chro.*35.8. *Hilkiah* the high Priest, and *Zachariah* and *Jehiel* Priests of the second order, are called *Rulers of the house of God*: being in that very place thus distinguished from other Priests and Levites imployed in the manuall worke of the Temple about Sacrifices and the like.

CHAP. IV.

That there was an Ecclesiasticall Excommunication among the Jewes: and what it was.

IT hath been affirmed by some who pretend to more skill in Jewish antiquities than others, that though the Jewes had an excommunication which did exclude a man from the liberty of civill fellowship, so that he might not come within foure cubits of his neighbour, (and so one man might and did excommunicate another) yet no man was judicially or by sentence of a Court excommunicated, at least not from the Temple, Sacrifices, and holy assemblies.

To these I shall in the first place oppose the judgement of others who have taken very much pains in searching the Jewish antiquities, and are much esteemed for their skill therein. [n] D. *Buxtorf* expoundeth חֵרֶם *cherem* to be a casting out of one from the holy assemblies, or an ejection from the Synagogue, and maketh it parallel to the Excommunicating of the incestuous man 1 *Cor.*5. [o] Mr *Selden* extendeth the Jewish Excommunication so farre, as to comprehend an exclusion from fellowship in prayer and holy assemblies, and makes it parallel

n *Lexicon Chald. Talmud. & Rabbin. edit.* 1639. pag. 817, 818. חרם *Excommunicatio, exclusio à cœtu sacro, ejectio ex synagoga &c.*

Cum tali excommunicato non licet edere nec bibere. Quo fortè respicit Apostolus 1 Cor. 5.11. Τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, *Nam admonitionem illam generalem fecit, ex occasione incestuosi quem excommunicare jubet.*

o *De Jure natur. & Gentium lib.*4 *cap.*9. *Atque is planè à communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii relegabatur, quemadmodum de hujusmodi anathemate sub initiis Ecclesiæ Christianæ loquitur Tertullianus.*

to

to that which *Tertullian* tels us to have been used by the Primitive Church. Mr *Brughton* in his exposition of the Lords prayer page 14. makes a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian Church in many particulars, and among the rest, he saith they agree in *the manner of Excommunication and absolution.* p *Henric. Verstius* in his late animadversions upon *Pirke Rabbi Eliezer*, wonders how any man can imagine that an Apostate, a blasphemer, or the like was admitted into the Temple. For his part, he thinkes some excommunicate persons were absolutely excluded from the Temple, and that others for whom there were hopes of reconciliation, were admitted into it. q *Drusius* and r *Johannes Coch* hold, that there were such excommunicate persons among the Jewes, as were removed from Church assemblies, and were not acknowledged for Church members. s *Schindlerus* describeth their excommunication to be a putting away of an impenitent obstinate sinner from the publique assembly of the Church, and so a cutting him off from his people. t *Arias Montanus* expounds their casting out of the Synagogue to be an excommunication (such as in the Christian Church) from religious fellowship. u So doe the Centurists plainly, where they doe purposely shew what was the Ecclesiasticall policy and Church government of the Jewes: They make it a distinct Question, whether the Jewes in Christs time had any civill

p *Animad in Pirke* pag. 169. *Quis enim dicat apostatam, blasphemum aliáque sacra capita intra templum fuisse admissa? &c. Certè si quibuslibet excommunicatis permissum fuisset intrare Templum, tum multò mitior Judaicæ Synagogæ disciplina esset statuenda, quam veteris Christianæ Ecclesiæ.*

q *Quæst. & Resp. l. 1. quæst.* 9 *Sokbant autem veteres (Judæi) si quis gravius deliquerat, primum eum movere cætu Ecclesiastico: si non emendabat se, tum feriebant anathemate: quòd sine tum quidem redibat ad frugem, ultimo ac postremo loco famati cabant.*

r *Annot. in Exc. Gemar. Sanhedrin cap. 1. Qui simpliciter excommunicatus est (menudde) est ille quidem separatus à cætu, ita ut pro vero membro Ecclesiæ non habeatur.*

s *Lexicon pentaglot.* pag. 655. חרם *Excommunicatio, cum quis se non emendans cætu Ecclesiastico movetur, & ex populo suo excinditur.* Where he also mentioneth the three distinct kinds of Excommunication *Niddui, Cherem*, and *Schammata. Ibid.* pag. 1076. נדוי *remotio, excommunicatio, ejectio ex cætu piorum, illa anathematis species, qua quis immundus ab hominum contubernio, aut qua aliquis à cætu Ecclesiastico removetur ad tempus à lege præscriptum.*

t *De arcano sermone cap. 47. Ejectio autem è Synagogâ, communicationis abnegatio est, & abalienatio à religiosa consuetudine, quæ à nostris recepto jam verbo Excommunicatio dicitur.*

u *Magdeb. Cent. 1. lib. 1. cap. 7. Indicabant dogmata & promulgabant eorum damnationes, una cum personis: quæ quidem res nihil aliud quam publica Excommunicatio erat* Joh. 9. 22. & 11. 47. 48. & 12. 42. *Et infra. Extra Synagogam fieret, hoc est excommunicaretur.*

Govern-

Government, or Magistracy. [x] *Cornelius Bertramus* thinks that to the Jewish *Niddui* answereth our suspension from the Sacrament, and that to their *cherem* answereth our excommunication from the Church: and that the Jewes had the very same kind of excommunication, by which the incestuous *Corinthian*, *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, and the Emperour *Theodosius* were excommunicated. *Constantinus l' Empereur annot. in rempub. Jud.* pag. 370. to 378. holdeth the same thing which *Bertramus* holdeth concerning the Jewish excommunication, and which hath now been cited. *Godwyn* in his *Moses and Aaron, lib.* 5. *cap.* 1 speaketh of the Ecclesiasticall Court of the Jewes, unto which (saith he) belonged the power of excommuication, the severall sorts of which censure he explaineth *cap.* 2. namely *Niddui*, *cherem*, and *Shammata*. After all which, he begins *cap.* 3. to speake of civill Courts of the Jewes, a distinct government.

Grotius. annot. in Luke 6. 22. compares the Jewish excommunication with that which was exercised by the *Druides* in *France*, who did *interdicere sacrificiis*, interdict and prohibit from their Sacrifices impious and obstinate persons. Yea those who were excommunicate by *Niddui* or the lesser excommunication, he likens to those penitents or mourners in the ancient Christian Church, who were said to be ἐν συγκλαύσει, *qui non cum cæteris orabant* &c. He tels us the ancient Christians did in divers things follow the Jewish discipline, and among other things in excommunication; He cites the same passage of *Tertullian* which is cited by Mr *Selden*, concerning a shutting out, à *communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii.* Which is as full and high a description of the Ecclesiasticall censure of Excommunication, as any can be. So that the Jewish Excommunication being paralleld with that Excommunication which *Tertullian* speakes of, and which was practised in the ancient Christian Church, what more can be required in this particular? And here I cannot but take notice, that Master *Prynne* doth very much mistake and misrepresent Mr *Selden*, as if he held the Jewish excommunication to have been no more but a shutting out from civill company or fellowship, whereas he

[x] *De r. pub. Ebr. cap* 7. *legis sanctio triplex &c. Prima est* נדוי *aversatio, amolitio & amandatio &c. Secunda est* חרם *devotio extremo cuidam exitio. Excommunicatio: quando videlicet aliquis excindi dicebatur ex populo suo, & in eo amplius non censeri (ut jam supra exposuimus) ex majore aliquo delicto. atque hoc puto esse ἀποσυνάγωγον fieri &c. Primæ illæ speciei respondet quod in Ecclesiis nostris vocamus prohibitionem seu suspensum à Sacramentis: secundæ Excommunicatio publicè facta.*

he clearly holds *lib.* 4. *de jure nat. & Gent. cap.* 9. p. 522. that he who was excommunicated by the Jewish *cherem*, was put away and cast off from fellowship in prayer, and from all religious fellowship, even as *Tertullian* speaks of excommunicated persons in the Church.

Lud. Capellus in Spicilegio upon *Joh.* 9. 22. speaking of the common distinction of the three degrees of the Jewish Excommunication, doth plainly beare witnesse to that which I plead for, namely, y that there was a Jewish Excommunication from communion in the holy things. I confesse he understands the *Cherem*, and the *Shammata*, otherwise then I doe; for he takes the *Cherem* to be *nihil aliud*, nothing else than the forfeiture of a mans substance for the use of the Sanctuary: (whereas it is certaine there was a *Cherem* of persons as well as of things, and the *formulæ* of the *Cherem* which shall be cited afterward, containe another thing than forfeiture.) And *Shammata* he takes to be the devoting of men to death, and that being Shamatized they must needs die. (And yet the Jewes did *shamatize* the *Cuthites* or *Samaritans* (as we shall see afterward) whom they had not power to put to death.) However he speaks of the *Niddui* as a meere Ecclesiasticall censure, and therefore tels us it was formidable to the godly, it being a shutting out from communion in the holy things, but not formidable to wicked men; which must be upon this reason, because wicked men did care little or nothing for any censure or punishment, except what was civill. He granteth also that *Niddui* was included in the other two: so that in all three there was a shutting out from the holy things.

y *Harum trium Excommunicationis specierum vel potius graduum, secunda primam, tertia utramque includebat. Prima piis quidem Judæis erat formidabilis, quia per eam à sacrorum communione submovebantur, at qui minus pii erant eâ non magnopere movebantur.*

I must not forget the Testimony of my Countreyman Master *Weemse* in his *Christian Synagogue lib.* 1. *cap.* 6. *sect.* 3. *paragr.* 7. *They had three sorts of Excommunication; first the lesser, then the middle sort, then the greatest. The lesser was called Niddui: and in the New Testament they were called* ἀποσυνάγωγοι, *put out of the Synagogue: and they hold that* Cain *was excommunicated this way. The second was called Cherem or Anathema: with this sort of Excommunication was the Incestuous person censured* 2 Cor. 2. *The third Shammatha, they hold that* Enoch *instituted it*, Jude v. 14. And after, *these who were* ἀποσυνάγωγοι, *put out of the Synagogue were not simply secluded*

from the Temple, but suffered to stand in the Gate, &c. These who were Excommunicated by the second sort of Excommunication, were not permitted to come neer the Temple. These who were Excommunicated after the third sort, were secluded out of the society of the people of God altogether.

And thus I have produced fifteen witnesses for the Ecclesiasticall Excommunication of the Jewes. I might produce many more, but I have made choice of these, because all of them have taken more than ordinary paines in searching the Jewish antiquities, and divers of them are of greatest note for their skill therein.

In the next place let us observe the causes, degrees, manner and rites how, the authority by which, the ends and effects of excommunication among the Jewes, and see whether all these doe not helpe to make their Excommunication a patterne for ours. For the causes, there were 24 causes, for which a man was Excommunicated among the Jewes. You may read them in *Buxtorfs Lexicon Chald. Talmud & Rabbin.* p. 1304, 1305. *M. Selden de jure nat. & Gentium. lib. 4. cap. 8. Jo. Coch Annot. in Excerp. Gem. Sanhedrin cap. 2.* pag. 147. divers of these causes did not at all concerne personall or civill injuries (for such injuries were not accounted causes of Excommunication, but were to be punished otherwise, as shall be proved afterward) but matters of scandall, by which God was dishonoured, and the stumbling-blocke of an evill example laid before others; One cause was the despising of any of the preceps of the Law of *Moses*, or Statutes of the Scribes. Another was the selling of Land to a Gentile. Another was, a Priest not separating the gifts of the oblation. Another, he that in captivity doth not iterate or observe the second time a holy day. Another, y he that doth any servile worke upon Easter eve. Another, he that mentioneth the name of God rashly, or by a vaine oath. Another, he that enduceth, or giveth occasion to others to prophane the name of God. Another, he that makes others to eate holy things without the holy Temple. Another, he that maketh computation of yeeres and moneths without the Land of *Israel*: that is, (as Dr *Buxtorf*) writeth Calendars, or (as M. *Selden*) computeth yeeres and moneths otherwise than their fathers

y *Buxtorf lexic. Rabbin.* p. 2463 ex *Pesachim fol.* 50. *Qui vesperâ sabbathi & aliorum dierum festorum operas serviles facit, infaustum illud quidem est, neque videt signum benedictionis, sed non schammatisamus eum: at qui vesperâ præcedentis operas serviles facit, hic verò omnino schammatisamus eum.* They did also excommunicate an heretical or Epicurean Israelite. *Buxtorf* ibid. pag. 195.

fathers had done. Another, he that retardeth or hindreth others from doing the Law and Commandement. Another, he that maketh the offering prophane (as Dr *Buxtorf*) or offereth a ſickly beaſt, (as *J. Coch.*) Another, a Sacrificer that doth not ſhew his Sacrificing Knife before a Wiſe man or a Rabbi, that it may be knowne to be a lawfull Knife, and not faulty. Another, he that cannot be made to know or to learne. Another, he that having put away his wife, doth thereafter converſe familiarly with her. Another, a Wiſe man (that is, a Rabbi or Doctor) infamous for an evill life. The other cauſes had alſo matter of ſcandall in them, namely, the deſpiſing of a Wiſe man or Rabbi, though it were after his death. The deſpiſing of an Officer or meſſenger of the houſe of judgement. He that caſteth up to his neighbour a ſervile condition, or calls his neighbour ſervant. He that contumaciouſly refuſeth to appeare at the day appointed by the Judge. He that doth not ſubmit himſelfe to the Judiciall ſentence. He that hath in his houſe any hurtfull thing, as a mad dogge or a weake leather. He that before Heathen Judges beareth witneſſe againſt an Iſraelite. He that maketh the blind to fall. He that hath Excommunicate another without cauſe, when he ought not to have been Excommunicate. Thus you have the 24 cauſes of the Jewiſh Excommunication; of which ſome were meere ſcandals: others of a mixed nature, that is, partly injuries, partly ſcandals; but they were reckoned among the cauſes of Excommunication *qua* ſcandals, not *qua* injuries. *Jo. Coch. Annot. in Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin.* pag. 146. explaining how the wronging of a Doctor of the Law by contumelies, was a cauſe of Excommunication, ſheweth that the Excommunication was becauſe of the ſcandall. *Licet tamen condonare niſi res in prapatulo geſta ſit. Publicum Doctoris ludibrium in legis contemptum redundat. Hanc ob cauſam Doctor legis honorem ſuum remittere non poteſt. Ubi res clam & ſine ſcandalo geſta eſt, magni animi & ſapientis eſt injuriam contemptu vindicare.* If there was no ſcandall, the injury might be remitted by the party injured, ſo as the offendor was not to be Excommunicate. But if the contumely was known abroad, and was ſcandalous, though the party wronged were willing and deſirous to bury it, yet becauſe of the ſcandall, the Law

provided that the offender should be excommunicate. For they taught the people that he who did contend against a Rabbi did contend against the holy Ghost (for which see *Gul Vorstius annot. in Maimon. de fundam. legis.* pag. 77, 78.) and hence did they aggravate an Ecclesiasticall or Divine (not a Civill) injury. Whence it appeareth that the causes of Excommunication, were formally lookt upon as scandals. Adde that if *qua injuries*, then *a quatenus ad omne*, all personall or civill injuries had been causes of Excommunication. But all civill injuries doe not fall within these 24. causes. If it be objected, that neither doe all scandalls fall within these 24. causes. I answer they doe; for some of the causes are generall and comprehensive, namely these two, the 5th. He that despiseth the Statutes of the Law of *Moses*, or of the Scribes; and the 18th. He that retardeth or hindereth others from doing the Law.

When I make mention of any particular heads, either of the Jewish Discipline, or of the ancient Christian discipline, let no man understand me, as if I intended the like Strictnesse of Discipline in these dayes. My meaning is onely, to prove Ecclesiasticall censures, and an Ecclesiasticall Government. And let this be remembred upon all like occasions; though it be not everywhere expressed. And so muchfor the causes.

The degrees of the Jewish excommunication, were נִדּוּי *Niddui*, חֵרֶם *Cherem*, שַׁמָּתָא *Schammata*. Elias *in Tishbite*, saith plainly that *there were three kinds of excommunication, Niddui, Cherem, and Schammata. Niddui is a casting out; but if he be not converted, they smite him with Cherem; and if neither so he repent, they schammatize him.* These three Doctor *Buxtorf* thus distinguisheth, not only out of *Elias*, the common sentence of the but Hebrew Doctors. The first and smallest excommunication is *Niddui*, which is a simple separation for a certain time. The greater excommunication is *Cherem*, which is a separation with imprecations and curses. The greatest of all is *Schammata*, a finall excommunication, without hope of returning to the Church. So likewise *Hen. Vorstius animad. in Pirke* pag. 230. And answerably hereunto some Divines have distinguished *Excommunicatio Minor*, *Major*, and *Maxima*. The first is suspension from the Sacrament. The second is a casting out of

of the Church, and a delivering over to Sathan: which yet is a medicinall excommunication for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved. The third is *Anathema Maranatha*, an accursing of a man to the coming of Christ, without hope of mercy; which is *excommunicatio exterminativa*, and cannot be done, without a prophaticall Spirit. *Corn. Bertramus de repub. Ebræor cap. 7.* saith that our suspension from the Sacrament answereth to their *Niddui*: our Excommunication to their *Cherem*. And for their *Schammata*, he thinks it was an adjudging of one to eternall death; whereunto answereth the Apostles *Anathema*, and the Churches devoting of *Julian* the Apostate, as one to be no more prayed for, but to be prayed against. *Munsterus* will have *Schammata* to be the same with *Niddui*. Wherein Master *Selden* agreeth with him, still holding a difference between *Niddui*, and *Cherem*, as between the lesser, and the greater excommunication: *de Iure nat. & Gentium, l. 4. c. 8.* Of the same opinion is *Io. Coch, Annot. in Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin. p. 149.* But *Constantinus l' Empereur annot. in rempub. Iud.* tels us, that the Talmudists in divers places, do distinguish the three degrees of Excommunication, as *Bertramus* doth; and that *Schammata* was the highest Excommunication, greater then either *Niddui* or *Cherem*, he proves not onely by the Epitheton *adonai* added by the Chaldee paraphrase *Num. 21. 25. Et percussit eum Israel per Schammata dei*; but further from the words of *Rabbi Solomon*, comparing one excommunicated by *Schammata*, to the fat cast in the Furnace, which is wholly consumed, and which never comes out, so he that is *Schammatized*, is lost for ever, and without all remedy unto all eternity. He confirmeth it also, from the words of *Elias* above mentioned. It is not much to my present argument, to dispute whether the Jewes had three distinct degrees of excommunication or two only. However it's agreed, that the Jews had their *Excommunicatio Minor & Major*. And *Niddui* was an Excommunication for 30. dayes, during which time if the person (man or woman) repent, well and good: if not, he was excommunicate, for other 30. dayes. Yea, saith Doctor *Buxtorf*, the time might be triplicate to 90. dayes. And if after all that time he repent not, then he was excommunicate, with the

greater excommunication *Cherem*. And so much for the degrees.

As for the manner, and rites of their excommunication, it was done most solemnly, (z) Doctor *Buxtorf* tells us, if the party was present, the sentence of Excommunication was pronounced against him by word of mouth: If he was absent, there was a writ publikely affixed, containing the sentence of Excommunication, which writ was not published, till the offence was proved, at least by two witnesses.

(z) *Lexicon. Chald. Talmud. & Rabbin.* pag. 2468. *Excommunicatio fiebat quandoque verbis expressis, quando excommunicandus erat præsens: quandoque scripto publicè affixo, quando absens erat. Hinc legitur in Majemone in libro Madda cap. 7. Sect. 2. Quomodo sit Niddui: dicit N. esto in excommunicatione. Si excommunicant eum in faciem, id est presentem, dicit N. hic esto in excommunicatione sive banno. Ibid. pag. 2469. Nuncius vel minister publicus judicii câ fide habetur, ut si dicat, N. à me citatus ad Judicium, contempsit me, aut vilipendit Iudicem, aut dixit se nolle comparere in Judicio, tunc sammatisent ipsum ad verba ejus, sed non scribunt super eo Schedam Excommunicationis Shammata, donec venerint duc quo testentur ipsum noluisse comparere ad Iudicium.*

It is certain from *Pirke Rabb. Elieser cap.* 38. that *Cherem* was not without an assembly of ten at least. And it is as certaine that *Cherem* was not onely in a solemn, but in a sacred manner performed, which is manifest from that *Formula Anathematis*, which (a) Doctor *Buxtorf* hath transcribed out of an old Hebrew Manuscript; and from (b) another forme, which *Hen. Vorstius*

(a) *Lexicon Rabbin.* p. 828. *Ex sententia domini Dominorum, sit in Anathemate Ploni Filius Ploni, in utraque domo Iudicii, Superiorum scilicet & Inferiorum, in Anathemate item Sanctorum Excelsorum, in anathemate Seraphim & Ophannim, in anathemate denique tot. us Ecclesiæ, maximorum & minimorum &c.*

(b) Another forme more full and large see in *Vorstius* his Animadversions upon *Pirke* pag. 226. to 230. Decreto vigilum atque edicto Sanctorum anathemizamus, adjuramus, excommunicamus Schammatizamus, maledicimus, execramus ex sententia hujus loci atque ex scientia hujus cœtûs, hoc libro legis, sexcentis tredecim præceptis in illo conscriptis. Anathemate quo Josua devovit Jericho; maledictione quâ maledixit Elisæus pueris, & maledictione quam imprecatus est Giehazi servo suo. Shammate quo Schammatizavit Barack Meroz, &c. Nomine *Aehtharie* Jah Domini Zebaoth. Nomine Michael Principis magni. Nomine *Matkatheron* cujus nomen est sicuti nomen Domini ejus. Nomine *Sandalphon* qui nectit coronas pro domino suo. Nomine *Nominis* 42. literarum. Nomine quod apparuit Mosi in Sinai. Nomine quo dissecuit Moses Mare. Nomine *Ehieh ascher Ehieh*, Ero qui ero. Arcano nominis *Amphorasch*. Scripturâ quæ exarata est in tabulis. Nomine Domini exercituum Dei Israelis, qui sedit inter cherubim, &c. Maledictus ex ore nominis celebrandi, & tremendi, quod effreditur ex ore Sacerdotis magni die expiationum, &c. Evellatur ipse è tabernaculo. Nolit dominus illi condonare, sed tunc fumet furor & indignatio contra virum illum. Incumbant illi omnes maledictiones conscriptæ in hoc libro legis. Expellat nomen ejus sub cælo, & segreget illum in malum ex omnibus tribubus Israelis, juxta omnes execrationes hujus fœderis consignatas in hoc libro legis, &c. Hæc sit voluntas Dei & dicatur Amen.

taketh

taketh out of *Col Bo* both shewing, that it was not a civill, but a sacred businesse, done in the name and authority of the God of heaven: and the latter *formula* still used in most of the Jewish Synagogues as *Vorstius* informes us

We read also in *Pirke Rabb. Eliezer cap.* 38. (c) that the *Cuthites* (who were also called *Samaritans*) after they had been circumcised by *Rabb. Dostai*, and *Rabbi Zacharias*, and had been taught by them out of the Book of the Law; they were excommunicate by *Ezra*, *Zerubbabel*, and *Iosua* the high Priest, 300. Priests, and 300. Disciples, and the whole Church, in the Temple; the Trumpets sounding, and the Levites singing; they did even by the great name of God, excommunicate the *Cuthites*, that there should be no fellow-ship between any man of Israel and the *Cuthites*, that no Proselyte should be received of the *Cuthites*; and that they should have no part in the resurrection of the dead, nor in the building of the house of God, nor in *Ierusalem*. This passage Doctor *Buxtorf*, in his *Rabbinicall Lexicon*, p. 2464. and Master *Selden de Iure nat. & Gentium. l.* 4. *c.* 8. have observed out of *Pirke*; and Doctor *Buxtorf*, both there and *dissert de lit. Hebr.* thes. 49. noteth the three words used by the Hebrews in this relation, ומחרימין ומשמתין ומנדין that is, they did excommunicate them both by *Niddui*, *Cherem*, and *Schammata*. And so much for the manner and rites.

(c) Quid tum fecerunt Ezra, Zerobabel, & Jehoshua? Congregaverunt totam Ecclesiam seu cœtum populi in templum domini & introduxerunt 300 sacerdotes, & 300. adolescentes (seu discipulos minores) quibus erant in manibus 300. buccinæ, & 300. libri legis. Hi clangebant; Levitæ autem cantabant & psallebant: & excommunicabant Cuthæos per mysterium nominis Tetragrammati, & per scriptu am descriptam in Tabulis legis, & per anathema fori superioris seu cælestis, & per anathema fori inferioris seu terrestris. ita ut nemo Israelitarum unquam in posterum comederet buccellam aliquam Cuthæorum. Hinc dicunt Quicunque comedit carnem Cuthæi, is vescitur quasi carne porcinâ. Cuthæus quoque ne fieret proselytus, neque haberet partem in resurrectione mortuorum, juxta illud quod scriptum est. *Non ad vos simul nobiscum attinet instauratio domus dei nostri*: neque in hoc neque in futuro seculo. Præterea quoque ne haberet partem in Jerusalem. hinc dicitur, *Vobis non est pars neque jus, neque memoria in Jerusalem.* Transmiserunt autem Anathema hoc ad Israelitas qui erant in Babylonia.

As for the authority, by which a man was excommunicated, we see (by that which hath been already noted) that it was a publike and judiciall act, and it was necessary there should be at least an Assembly of ten. Those *formulæ* before cited, make it evident, that it was an authoritative sentence of an Ecclesiasticall Assembly, (and therefore done as it were in name of the Court of

of heaven, to which purpose *domus Iudicii superioris seu cœlestis*, was mentioned in the businesse, and it was a juridicall or forensicall act, and done solemnly in the Temple, in that case of the *Cuthites*) *Drusius de tribus Sectis Iudæorum lib.* 4. *Num.* 237. concerning the Discipline of the *Essæans*, and their Excommunicating of ungodly persons, tells us it was done by a hundreth men Assembled together. It is very true, which Mr. *Selden* observeth, *de Iure nat. & Gentium l* 4. *c.* 8. the Hebrews writ of a Judiciall excommunication, and of an extrajudiciall excommunication, by which one private man might excommunicate another. Yet, that extrajudiciall excommunication could not stand in force, unlesse it were ratified by the Court; and of it selfe, it was rather *optative*, or *imprecative*, than *obligative*: as is manifest by the Instance, which (d) *Jo. Coch* gives us *ex Gem. Moed Caton.* Two men having mutually excommunicated each other, it commeth to an authoritative decision. He that had excommunicated the other, for that for which he ought to have been punished by a pecuniall mulct, but not by excommunication, was himself justly excommunicate by the other, according to the last of the 24. causes of excommunication before mentioned, that is, that he who unjustly excommunicateth another, shall be himselfe excommunicated. So the excommunicating of the one man for a civill injury was declared null: and the excommunicating of the other, for his unjust act of excommunication, was ratified. Which doth not onely prove what I have said of private, or extrajudiciall excommunication: but also confirme what I asserted before, concerning the causes of excommunication, that it was not for personall or civill injuries, but for matter of scandall. And that pecuniary mulcts and excommunication, were not inflicted for the same but for different causes. And so much for the authority.

(d) *Anvot Gem in Ex. Sanhedrin.* p. 247. *R. Simon, fil. Lakisch custoaiebat horum venit quidam & ficus cepit vrare. Ille inclamare: hic non nauci facere. Tum ille: excommunicatus esto. Tu vicissim irquit alter excommunicatus esto. Nam si ad pecuniam tibi obstrictus sum, numquid anathemati obnoxius sum? Adiit R. Lakisch super hoc Scholæ rectorem. Responsum est: Ipsius Anathema anathema est: tuum nullum est.*

The effects of excommunication were (e) these. He might not be admitted into an Assembly of ten persons. He might not sit within foure cubits to his neighbour. He might not shave his hair, nor wash himself. It was not lawfull to eat nor drinke with him. He that dyed in excommunication got no Funerals, nor was there any mourning made for him, but a stone was set over him, to signifie that he was worthy to be stoned,

(e) *Buxtorf. Lexicon Chald. Talm. & Rab.* p. 1305. 828.

stoned, because he did not repent, and because he was separated from the Church. An excommunicate person might not make up the number of ten, where there were nine. The reason was because he might not be acknowledged for a Church Member, or one who could make up a lawfull Assembly. *Drusius de tribus sectis Iudæorum lib. 3. cap. 11.* draweth two consequences from that excommunication of the *Cuthites* before mentioned. 1. That it was not lawfull for a Jew, to eat bread with a Samaritan. 2. That the Samaritans were cut off from the Jewish Church, and that without hope of regresse, being Shammatized.

It is more disputable, how farre forth Exommunication did deprive a man of the liberty of accesse into the Temple. The Talmudists hold, that of old an Excommunicate person might enter into the Temple, yet so as he might be known that he was Excommunicate. It is said in *Pirke Rabb. Eliezer cap. 17.* that *Solomon* built two Gates, one for Bride-grooms, another for Mourners and Excommunicated persons; and when the Children of Israel, sitting between these two Gates, upon the Sabbath-dayes and Holy-dayes, did see a Bride-groome come in, they knew him, and did congratulate with him: but when they saw one come in at the doore of the mourners, having his Lips covered, they knew him to be a mourner, and said, *He that dwells in this house, comfort thee.* But when they saw one come in at the doore of mourners, with his Lips not covered, they knew him to be Excommunicated, and spake to him on this manner. *He that dwells in this house comfort thee, and put into thy minde, to hearken unto thy Neighbours.* The like you have *in codice Middoth cap. 2. Sect. 2.* where it is said that ordinarily, all that came into the Temple, did enter upon the right hand; and they went out upon the left hand, those excepted to whom some sad thing had befallen; and when it was asked of such a one, why dost thou enter upon the left hand, he either answered, that he was a mourner, and then it was said to him, *He that dwells in this house comfort thee*, or he answered, because I am Excommunicate (so readeth *Buxtorf*) or *quia ego contaminatus rejicior* (so readeth *l' Empereur*) and then it was said to him, *He that dwells in this house, put into thy minde, to hearken to the words of thy companions, that they may restore thee.* The same

thing is cited *e libro Musar* by *Drusius praeter. lib.* 4. in Jo. 9. 22. His opinion is that המנדים those that were separate and excommunicate by the lesser excommunication, were admitted into the Temple, in the manner aforesaid: but that they were not admitted into the Synagogue: because its added *in libro Musar*, (which I finde also added in the fore-mentioned place of *Pirke R Elies.*) that after the temple was destroyed, it was decreed, that Bride-grooms and Mourners should come into the Synagogues, and that they in the Synagogue, should congratulate with the one, & condole with the other. Behold saith *Drusius*, no mention here of excommunicate persons, for they did not come into the Synagogues. Peradventure every Excommunicate person, had not accesse to the Temple neither, but he that was extrajudicially, or by private persons excommunicate, as those words might seeme to intimate, *He that dwells in this house put into thy mind, to hearken to thy neighbours or companions, that they may restore thee.* Or if you take it to extend to judiciall excommunication, then *Hen. Vorstius* doth expound it, *animad. in Pirke* p. 169. (f) so, as it may be understood onely of the lesser excommunication, when there was still hope of repentance, and reconciliation. So *Io. Coch. ubi supra* pag. 149. thinks that an excommunicate person was not altogether cast out of the Synagogue, but was permitted to heare, and to be partaker of the Doctrine, but otherwise and in other things he was separate, and not acknowledged for a Church Member; and this he saith of מנודה *menudde*, of him that was simply excommunicate by the lesser excommunication or *Niddui*. But he saith otherwise of him that was excommunicate with *Cherem*. *Non docet, non docetur.* He is neither permitted to teach, nor to be taught. *Grotius* on *Luke* 6.22. tells us, that excommunicate persons under *Niddui*, came no otherwise to the Temple than Heathens did, that is, had no liberty to come into the Court of Israel. However, such as were excommunicate by *Cherem were not permitted to come neere the Temple*, saith Master *Weemse* in his *Christian Synag.* p. 138. An excommunicate person of the first sort, (*Niddui*,) when he came to the Temple, or Synagogue, you see (by what hath been said) he was there publikely bearing his shame, and looked upon as one separate from the Com-

(f) *De his meritò dubitari potest, num licuerit ipsis sacra adire limina, imprimis qui severiori excommunicationis genere vel* חרם *multati erant. Quis enim dicat Apostatam, blasphemum, aliáq; sacra capita intra Templum fuisse admissa? De* מנודם *alia ratio esse potest, cum his spes veniæ non fuerit adempta.*

Communion of the people of God. And so much for the effects.

The end of Excommunication was spirituall, (f) that a sinner being by such publike shame and separation humbled, might be gained to repentance, and thereby his soule saved; (which is the end of Church Discipline, not of civill censures.) The Court waited 90. dayes upon his Repentance, and did not proceed to *Cherem*, except in case of his continuing impenitency, when all that time he gave no signe of repentance, nor sought absolution.

From all that hath been said, I hope it's fully manifest, that the Jewish excommunication was an Ecclesiasticall censure, and not (as (h) Master *Prynne* would have it) *a civill excommunication, like to an outlary at Common Law.*

I conclude with a passage of *Drusius de Tribus Sectis Iudæorum lib. 4. cap. 22.* concerning the *Essæans*, who did most religiously retaine the Discipline of *Excommunication. Ius dicturi inter se congregantur centum viri, qui eos quos deprehenderint reos & improbos expellunt e cætu suo.* These words he citeth out of *Salmanticenses. Being to Iudge or give sentence among themselves, a hundreth men are gathered together, who doe expell from their Assembly those whom they find to be guilty and ungodly.* He addeth this Testimony of *Rufinus. Deprehensos verò in peccatis à sua congregatione depellunt. Such as are deprehended in sinnes they put away from their Congregation.* Loe, an Ecclesiasticall Excommunication because of scandalous sinnes.

(f) M. *Selden de Iure natur. & Gentium lib. 4. cap. 8. Effectus ac finis excommunicationis hujusmodi, Iure communi erat, ut solitæ populari consuetudinis libertate reus privaretur, usque dum pœnitentiâ ad bonam mentem rediens solveretur sententiâ.*

(h) *Independency examined* pag. 10. *Vindic. of the 4. Questions p. 4. 5*

Chap. V.

Of the cutting off from among the people of God, frequently mentioned in the Law.

It hath been much controverted, what should be the meaning of that commination, so frequently used in the Law of *Moses: that soule shall be cut off from among his people.* The *radix* כָּרַת signifieth properly such a cutting off, as is like the cutting off a Branch from the Tree: and כְּרִיתוּת *cutting off*, is applied to divorcement, *Deut.* 24. 1. *a bill of divorcement*, in the Hebrew,

of cutting off. So *Isa.*50.1. *Jer.*3.8. It is certaine that כָּרַת *carath* doth not necessarily signifie to cut off by death, destruction, or a totall abolition of the very existence of him that is cut off, but any cutting off, by whatsoever losse or punishment it be. The Septuagints render it, not seldome, by such words as signifie the losse or punishment of the party, without destroying him, as by κόπτω, ἐκκόπτω, ἐκκόπτω, κολαφίζω, *abscindo, amputo, succido, excindo*, ὑποστρώω *avello, abstraho*, ὑποστρώω, *demitto* περιτέμνω, *circumcido*, ἀφαιρέω, ἐξαίρω, *aufero*, πλήσσω *percutio*, πλήσσω *verbero*. Sometime they render it by ἐντερίζω *contero, extero, terendo excutio: to strike out*, (sometime, *to wash out*, or, *to wipe off* spots or filth, as *H.Stephanus* tels us: thence ἔντριμμα, the cloth wherewith we wipe our hands when we wash them) *Numb.*19.13. *that soule shall be cut off from Israel.* The Septuagints ἐκτριβήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Yea where they render it by ἐξολοθρεύω, that ἐξολόθρευσις or cutting off is sometimes meant of captivity *Amos* 1.5. sometimes of the decay and dissolution of a Monarchy *Ezech.*31.12. Sometimes of the deposition or repudiating of Priests. 1 *Sam.*2.33. *the man of thine whom I shall not cut off from mine Altar.* Sometimes generally for a judgement or punishment, *Isa.*22.25. The English translators in some places where it is כָּרַת in the originall and ἐξολοθρεύω, render it *to faile*, 1 *Kings* 2.4. to loose 1 *Kings* 18.5. Sometime they render the same originall word *to hew*, 1 *Kings* 5.6. *to hew timber*, *Jer.*66. Sometime simply *to cut*, *Ezech.*16.4. *thy navell was not cut.* In other places where the Septuagints have ἐξαίρω *aufero*, the English hath *to faile*, 1 *Kings* 8.25 & 9.5.2 Chro. 7.18. This ἐξαίρω is the word used by the Apostle in the case of Excommunication, 1 Cor.5.13.

There are five different opinions concerning that *cutting off* mentioned in the Law. First, *Augustine* in divers places, understands the meaning to be of the second death or eternall condemnation. But this is not sutable to the infancy of the Jewish Church; for whiles they were bred under the pædagogy of the Law, things eternall and invisible were not immediately and nakedly propounded unto them, but under the shadows and figures of temporall and visible things. So that if eternall death were the ultimate intendment of that commination (as I verily

verily believe it was) yet it must needs be acknowledged, that there was some other punishment in this life, comprehended under that phrase, to resemble in some sort, and to shadow forth that everlasting cutting of.

2. Some understand that cutting off to be when a man dieth ἄτεκνος, without children, having no off-spring or posterity behind him to preserve the memory of him; for he that left children behind him, was esteemed to live in some sort after he was dead. But the cutting off in the Law, is *privative*, not *negative*, it is a depriving of a man of what he hath, not the deniall of what he would have. Neither was that of the preserving of ones name in the posterity, applicable to women, but to their husbands onely; whereas their cutting off was threatned to all that were guilty, whether men or women. Finally, if that were the sence, then the cutting off did neither belong to such as choosed voluntarily to live unmarried, nor to men who being married had children to preserve their memory after their death. But all that committed such or such a sinne, were to be cut off, whether married or unmarried, whether having children or wanting children.

3. Others understand capitall punishment to be inflicted by the civill Magistrate. But if all the offences for which *cutting off* was threatned in the Law, had been punished by death, the Mosaicall lawes, no lesse then those of *Draco*, might have been said to be written in blood, saith [i] *Gersomus Bucerus*. Is it credible that all and every one, who did by any chance, eate the fat, or the blood, or did make a perfume for smell like to the holy perfume, or did touch a dead body, or a grave, or a tent wherein a man had died, or any thing which an unclean person had touched; and had not been thereafter sprinkled with the water of separation; were without mercy to die for any of these things? Yet these were cut off from among their people *Exod.* 30. 38. *Lev.* 7. 15, 17. *Num.* 19. 13. 20. Another reason I take from *Mercerus* on *Gen.* 17. 14. We nowhere finde either in Scripture, or in the Jewish writings, that such of the seed of *Abraham*, as did neglect circumcision, were punished by the Sword of the Magistrate, yet by the Law such were to be cut off. Now without all controversie such were excluded from com-

[i] *De gubern. Eccl.* pag. 57.

communion with the Church of *Israel*, and being so excluded they were said properly to be cut off from among their people, saith *Mercerus*. And moreover the cutting off in the Law, is expressed by such a word, as doth not necessarily signifie that the person cut off ceaseth to have any being, but it is used to signifie a cutting off from a benefit, relation, or fellowship, when the being remains, as was noted in the beginning.

4. Many of the Hebrews whom M. *Ainsworth annot.* in *Gen.* 17.14. *Exod.*31.14. *Numb.* 15.30. followeth, understand by that cutting off, untimely death, or the shortning of life, before the naturall period. This interpretation I also dislike, upon these reasons, 1. That which is taken for a foundation of that opinion, namely, that the cutting off in the Law is meant onely as a punishment of private sinnes known to God alone, and which could not be proved by witnesses; this (I say) is taken for granted which is to be proved. 2. Yea, the contrary appeareth from *Levit.*17.4,5. the end of that cutting off was, that the children of *Israel* might feare to doe that thing which they saw so punished. But how could they make this use of a Divine judgement inflicted for some private sinne, they knew not for what? 3. The commination of Divine judgements is added in a more proper place *Deut.* 28. *Lev.* 26. and in divers places, where wrath and punishment from God is denounced against all such as would not observe his Commandements, nor keepe his Statutes and Judgements. But the *cutting off* is a part (and a great part) of the corrective or penall Mosaicall Lawes, which containe punishments to be inflicted by men, not by God; which makes *Piscator* almost everywhere in his *Scholia* to observe, that *exscindetur* is put for *exscinditor*, *that soule shall be cut off* for, *let that soule be cut off.* 4 The cutting off was a distinguishing punishment; they that did such and such things were to be cut off, and in being cut off, were to beare their iniquity, *Lev.*18. 29. *Numb.* 15.31. But we cannot say that *Abijah* the sonne of *Jeroboam*, or King *Josiah*, being taken away by an untimely death, were thereby marked with a signe of Gods wrath, or that they were cut off from among their people, and did beare their iniquity. 5. And whereas they object from *Levit.* 17.10. & 20.5,6. that the cutting of

was

was a worke of God, not of men, it is easily answered from that same place, it was onely so, in extraordinary cases, when men did neglect to punish the offenders. *Levit.*20.4,5. *And if the people of the land hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not: then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off.* Which giveth light to the other place *Levit.* 17. 10. What I have said against the third and fourth opinion, doth militate against *Erastus*, for he expoundeth the *cutting off* these two waies, that is either of capitall punishment, or of destruction by the hand of God, yet he inclineth chiefly to the last. See *lib.*3.*c.*6. He toucheth this cutting off in divers places but *valde jejunè*. And because he is pleased to profesſe he had no skil of the Hebrew, he appealeth to the word ἐξολοθρεύω. Of which before.

There is a fifth exposition, followed by many both Popish and Protestant writers, who understand by the *cutting off*, excommunicating or casting out from the Church, and of this opinion are some very good Hebritians, as *Schindlerus lexic. pentagl.* pag. 655. *Cornelius Bertramus de republica Ebræorum.* cap.2. *Godwyns Moses and Aaron* lib. 3. cap. 4. The Jewish Canons of Repentance printed in Latin at *Cambridge*, *anno* 1631. where the Hebrew hath כרת the Latin hath ordinarily *Excommunicatio.* So doe divers of our soundest writers take the cutting off in the Law to be excommunication. *Synopſ. pur. Theol. Disp.* 48. *Thes.* 24. 39. There are these reasons for it.

1. The cutting off had reference to an Ecclesiasticall corporation or fellowship. It is not said, *that soule shall be cut off from the earth*, or *cut off from the Land of the living*, but, *cut of from his people:* more plainly, *from Israel*, *Exod.*12.15. *Num.* 19. 13. but most plainly, *that soule shall be cut off from the Congregation (or Church) of Israel*, Exo. 12. 19. *that soule shall be cut off from among the Congregation (or Church) Num.* 19. 20. intimating somewhat Ecclesiasticall. So *Lev.*22.3. *that soule shal be cut off from my presence.* The Septuagints ἀπ' ἐμοῦ *from me.* The Chaldee, *from my face.* And this was the very cutting off or excommunication of *Cain* from the Church, by God himselfe *Genes.* 4. 14. *from thy face shall I be hid.* and vers. 14, *and Cain went out from the presence of the Lord.* It is another and much different phrase, which

which is used to expresse cutting off from the world, or from the land of the living *Ezech.*25.7. *I will cut thee off from the people, and will cause thee to perish out off the Countreys,* Jerem.11.19. *Let us cut him off from the land of the living.* Zeph.1.3. *I will cut off man from off the Land.*

2. He that in his uncleanesse did eate of an unholy thing was to be cut off *Levit.* 7.20,21. yet for such a one was appointed confession of sinne, and a trespasse-offering, by which he was reconciled and atonement made for him, as M. *Ainsworth* himselfe tels us on *Levit.*5.2. whence I inferre, that the cutting off such a one was not by death inflicted, either from the hand of the Magistrate, or from the hand of God, but that the cutting off was Ecclesiasticall, as well as the reception or reconciliation. I know M. *Ainsworth* is of opinion that the cutting off was for defiling the Sanctuary *presumptuously*, or eating of an holy thing presumptuously, when a man was not cleansed from his uncleanesse: and that atonement by sacrifice was appointed for such as defiled the Sanctuary *ignorantly.* But that which made him thinke so, was a mistake; for he supposeth, that for sinnes of ignorance or infirmity onely, God did appoint Sacrifices; but that for wilfull or malicious sinnes there was no Sacrifice. See his annot. on *Levit.* 4.2. Which *Faustus Socinus* also holdeth *prælect.* cap.22.p.144. But to me, the contrary is plaine from *Levit.*6.1. to 8. where we have atonement to be made by Trespasse offerings, for wilfull lying, perjury, fraud, robbing, or violence, which made the Septuagints, V.2. for *commit a trespasse*, to read, *despising despise the commandements of the Lord.* And whereas M. *Ainsworth* confirmeth his opinion from *Heb.* 10.26. *for if we sinne wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for sinnes*; I answer with *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Hemmingius*, and others upon the place, it is not meant of all sinnes done wilfully, (which to hold were a most dangerous and despairing Doctrine,) but of a totall defection from Christ and the truth. And now to returne, there is nothing *Levit.* 5.2. to exclude a Trespasse-offering for one who should in his uncleanesse wilfully goe to the Sanctuary, or touch an holy thing: but there is this reason, why it should not be excluded, because in that very

very place Verse 1. he that did wilfully, for favour or malice, conceale his knowledge, being a witnesse in judgement, was yet admitted to bring his Trespasse-offering.

3. The Apostle 1 *Cor.* 5. gives us some light concerning the cutting off; for as Vers. 6, 7, 8. most manifestly he pointeth at the purging of all the congregation of *Israel* from leaven, *Exod.* 12. so Vers. 13. when he saith, *therefore put away from among your selves that wicked person*, he plainly alludeth to *Exod.* 12. 15, 19. *Whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soule shall be cut off from the Congregation, (or Church) of Israel. Theophylact* on 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. observeth the Apostles allusion to the old Law of cutting off: and *Maccovius* (otherwise no very good friend to Church-discipline and Government) *loc. com. disp.* 22. proveth that Excommunication was transferred from the Jewes to us, by Christ himselfe *Matth.* 18. and that the cutting off mentioned in the Law, is no other thing than that which the Apostle meaneth, when he saith, *put away from among your selves that wicked person.*

4. The cutting off soule from among his people did typifie or resemble eternall death and condemnation; In which respect *Peter* doth some way apply it to the daies of the Gospell, that every soule which will not heare Christ the great Prophet, *shall be destroyed from among his people, Acts* 3. 23. So *Vatablus* on *Gen.* 17. 14. *that soul shall be cut off*, that is, shall not be partaker of my promises, and of my benefits. So that as *J. Coch. annot. in Sanhedrin. cap.* 9. saith well, death inflicted by the hand of God is lesse then כרת cutting off. *Nam exterminii post mortem pœna luitur.* The same thing *Guil. Vorstius* confirmeth out of *Maimonides, annot. in Maimon. de fundam. legis* pag. 127. And *Abrabanel de capite fidei cap.* 8. saith that *the greatest reward is the life of the world to come, and the greatest punishment is the cutting off of the soule.* Now this could not so fitly be resembled, and shadowed forth by the cutting off from the land of the living, either by the hand of God, or by the hand of the Magistrate, as by cutting off from the Church, and from the communion of Saints, by excommunication, which is *summum futuri judicii præjudicium*, as *Tertullian* called it, and fore-sheweth that *the ungodly shall not stand in the judgement, nor*

sinners in the congregation of the righteous, *Psal.* 1.5. But Gods taking away of a man by death in the phrase of the Old Testament, is not a *cutting off from*, but a *gathering of him unto his people*; yea [k] it is said of wicked *Ishmael* when he died, he *was gathered unto his people*. And as for the abbreviation of life, and the untimelinesse of death in youth, or middle age, that both is now, and was of old, one of the things which come alike to all; to the good as well as to the bad. As touching the capitall punishment of malefactors by the hand of the Magistrate, it being founded upon the very law of nature, and common to all Nations, without as well as within the Church, (so that very often those from whom a malefactor is cut off, are not so much as by profession the Church and people of God:) it cannot so fitly resemble the separation or casting out of a man from having part or portion of the inheritance of the Saints in light.

k Gen. 25. 17.

5. Dr. *Buxtorf lexic. chald. Talm. & Rabbin.* page 1101. tels us that this difference was put between him that was guilty of cutting off, and him that was guilty of death. *Reus mortis, ipse tantum, non semen ejus: pœna excidii comprehendit ipsum & semen ejus.* Now if the punishment of death was personall onely and the punishment of cutting off, comprehensive not onely of them but of their seed, how can this agree so well, to any thing else, as to Excommunication; especially if that hold which *Godwyn* in his *Moses and Aaron lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. tels us, that the children of excommunicate persons were not circumcised.

6. M. *Selden de jure nat. & Gent. lib.* 7. *cap.* 10. tels us, that the Hebrew Doctors themselves doe not agree concerning that cutting off in the Law. He saith that *R. Bechai* and others, make three sorts of cutting off. *1.* a cutting off, whereby the body onely is cut off, which they understand by that phrase *Levit.* 20. 6. *I will cut him off from among his people*: and this is untimely death *Psalm* 55. 23. *Bloudy and deceitfull men shall not live out half their daies.* 2. They say there was another cutting off, which was of the soule onely, *Levit.* 18. 29. *the souls that commit these things shall be cut off from among their people.* By this cutting off (they say) the soule ceaseth to have a being, the body not being taken away by death, before the naturall period. 3. They make a third kind, whereby both soule and body is cut off,

Num.

Num. 15. 31. *That soule shall be utterly cut off, his iniquity shall be upon him.* Whereby (say they) both the body is destroyed before the naturall time, and likewise the soule ceaseth to have a being. But whatsoever any of the Hebrews fancied in their declining latter times, concerning that second kinde of cutting off, (which M. *Selden* doth not approve, but relate out of them) I am confident it was onely the degenerating notion of Excommunication; and that very fancy of theirs, is a footstep thereof: which may make us easily believe that the more ancient Hebrews in purer times, did understand that such a cutting off was mentioned in the Law, by which a man in respect of his Spirituall being was cut off from the Church of *Israel*, whiles his naturall life and being was not taken from him. Yea *Gul elmus Vorstius annot. in Maimon. de fundam. legis* pag. 60. sheweth us, that some of the Hebrewes acknowledge nothing under the name of the cutting off, but that which is the cutting off of the soule onely. But if there be so much as some cutting off mentioned in the Law, which concerneth a mans Spirituall estate onely, it doth abundantly confirme what I plead for: and I shall not need to assert, that everywhere in the Law Excommunication must needs be understood by cutting off. Some understand the cutting off in the Judiciall or Civill lawes, to be meant of capitall punishments: and the cutting off in the ceremoniall Lawes (which were properly Ecclesiasticall) to be meant of Excommunication, or cutting off from the Church onely. If anywhere the cutting off be Excommunication, it sufficeth me. Or what ever it may signifie more, or be extended unto, if Excommunication be one thing which it signifieth, then they who thinke it signifieth some other thing beside Excommunication, are not against me in this question.

I shall conclude with that in the Dutch Annotations upon *Gen.* 17. 14. *that soule shall be cut off from his people.* The Annotation Englished saith thus, *that man shall be excommunicate from the fellowship of Gods people. This kind of expression implies also (as some doe conceive) a bodily punishment to be inflicted withall by the Magistrate.* They hold determinately and positively that it signifieth Excommunication. Whether it signifie some other

thing beside, they judge not to be so cleare, and therefore offer it to be considered.

It is but a poore argument, whereby Bishop *Bilson, of the Government of the Church, chap.* 4. would prove the cutting off not to be meant of Excommunication, because it is applyed even to capitall offences, such as the Law elsewhere appointeth men to be put to death for. As if it were any absurdity to say, that one and the same offence, is to be punished *sub formalitate scandali* with excommunication, and *sub formalitate criminis* with capitall punishment. And who knoweth not that a capitall crime is a cause of excommunication, which is also sometimes the sole punishment, the Magistrate neglecting his duty. If a known blasphemer or incestuous person be not cut off by the Magistrate as he ought by the Law of God: shall he therefore not be cut off by excommunication? If he had proved that all the causes of cutting off in the Law were capitall crimes, he had said much: but that will never be proved.

Chap. VI.

Of the casting out of the Synagogue.

We read of a casting out of the Church, which was pretended to be a matter of conscience and religion, and such as did more especially concerne the glory of God, *Isa. 66. 5. Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my names sake, said, let the Lord be glorified.* Such was the casting out of the Synagogue, mentioned in the Gospell *Joh. 9. 22.* & *12. 42.* & *16. 2. Arias Montanus de arcano Sermone cap.* 47. expounds it of excommunication from Church Assemblies. So the *Magdeburgians cent. 1. lib. 1. cap. 7.* and *Corn. Bertramus de repub. Ebræor. cap. 7. Godwyn* in his *Moses and Aaron, lib. 3. cap. 4.* & *lib. 5. cap. 2.* Wherein the interpreters also upon the places cited doe generally agree, *Erasmus, Brentius, Tossanus, Diodati, Cartwright* in his harmony, *Gerhard, &c.* So likewise M. *Leigh* out of *Paulus Tarnovius*, Ἀποσυνάγωγος dicitur *ejectus e cœtu sacro Ecclesiæ, excommunicatus.* See *Critica Sacra* of the new Test.

pag.

pag. 391. So doth *Aretius*, *Theol. Probel. loc.* 133. (though cited by our Opposites againstus) he saith, though it was abused by the Pharisees, yet it sheweth the Antient use of the the thing it self, that there was such a discipline in the Jewish Church. It is not much materiall, to dispute which of the degrees of the Jewish Excommunication, or whether all the three were meant by that casting out of the Synagogue. *Drusius*, and *Grotius* expound, *Jo.* 9. 22. of *Niddui*. *Gerhard* expounds *Jo.* 16. 2. of all the three *Niddui*, *Cherem*, and *Shammata*. It is enough for this present argument, if it was a spirituall, or Ecclesiasticall Censure, not a civill punishment. Master *Prynne*, *Vindic.* pag. 48, 49. tels us. First, this casting out of the Synagogue, was not warranted by Gods Word, but was onely a humane invention. Secondly, as it was practiced by the Jewes, it was a diabolicall institution. Thirdly, that it was meerly a civill Excommunication, like to an *Outlary*, whereby the party cast out, was separate from civill conversation onely, or from all company with any man, but was not suspended from any Divine Ordinance. Fourthly, that it was inflicted by the Temporall Magistrate. Fifthly, that in the Jewish Synagogues at that time, there was neither Sacrament nor Sacrifice, but onely Reading, Expounding, Preaching, Disputing, and Prayer, so that it cannot prove suspension from the Sacrament. To the first, I answer, it was not onely warranted by the cutting off mentioned in the Law, but *Erastus* himselfe gives a warrant for it from Gods word. He saith, *pag.* 315. the casting out of the Synagogue, was *vel idem vel simile quidpiam* with that *separating from the congregation Ezra.* 10. 8. To the second *Aretius* hath answered. The best things in the world may be abused. To the third, I offer these eight considerations to prove that it was an Ecclesiasticall, not a civill Censure.

First, the causes for which men were put out of the Synagogues, were matters of scandall; offences in point of Religion, and we read of none cast out of the Synagogue for a civill injury or crime; It was for confessing Christ *Jo.* 9. 22. & 12. 42. then counted heresie: and for Preaching of the Gospell *Jo.* 16. 2.

Secondly, The Synagogicall Assembly or Court, was Spiri-

tuall and Ecclesiasticall, as *Ludoviens de Dieu* noteth upon *Matth* 10. 17. we read of *the Rulers of the Synagogue*, *Act.* 13. 15. among whom he that did preside and moderate, was called *the chiefe Ruler of the Synagogue* Act. 18. 8. 17. names never given to civill Magistates or Judges. Therefore *Brughton* makes this of the Rulers of the Synagogue, to be one of the paralells betweene the Jewish, and the Christian Church. See his *exposition of the Lords Prayer* pag. 14. 16. As for that Assembly of the Pharisees, which did cast out, or excommunicate the blind man, *Io.* 9. *Toffanus* upon the place calls it *Senatus Ecclesiasticus*; and *Brentius* argueth from this example against the infallibility of Councells, because this Councell of the Pharisees call'd Christ himselfe a sinner.

3 The Court of civill Judgement, was in the Gates of the City, not in the Synagogue.

4 Such as the Communion and fellowship was in the Synagogue, such was the casting out of the Synagogue. But the Communion or fellowship, which one enjoyed in the Synagogue, was a Church-Communion and Sacred fellowship, in acts of Divine worship. Therefore the casting out of the Synagogue was also Ecclesiasticall and Spirituall, not civill or temporall.

4 The end was Sacred and Spirituall, to glorifie God *Is.* 66. 5. to doe God good service *Io.* 16. 2. in that which did more immediately and neerly touch his name and his glory; Though the Pharisees did falsely pretend that end, their error was not in mistaking the nature of the Censure, but in misapplying it where they had no just cause.

5 Master *Prynne* himself tells us pag. 49. That this excommunication from the Synagogue was of force forty dayes (though I beleeve he hath added ten more then enough, and if he look over his Bookes better, he will find he should have said thirty,) yet so as that it might be shortned upon repentance. But I pray, are civill punishments shortned or lengthened according to the parties repentance? I know Church Censures are so. But I had thought, the end of civill punishments, is not to reclaime a mans soule by repentance, and then to be taken off: but to guard the Lawes of the Land, to preserve Justice, Peace,

and

and good order, to make others feare to doe evill, to uphold the publike good. The Magistrate must both punish and continue punishments, as long as is necessary for those ends, whether the party be penitent or not.

6 How is it credible, that the holy Ghost meaning to expresse a casting out from civill company or conversation onely, (which was not within, but without the Synagogue) would choose such a word as signifieth the casting out from an Ecclesiasticall or Sacred Assembly? (for such were the Synagogues, in which the Jewes had Reading, Expounding, Preaching and Prayer, as Master *Prynne* tells us) Christ himselfe distinguisheth the Court or Judicatory, which was in the Synagogue, from civill Magistracy *Luk.* 12. 11. *And when they bring you unto the Synagogues, and unto Magistrates and Powers.* Magistrates and Powers are civill Rulers, supreame and subordinate, but the Synagogues are distinct Courts from both these.

7 Our Opposites cannot give any other rationall interpretation of the word ἀποσυνάγωγος. *Erastus* pag. 315. confesseth, it is very hard to tell what it was. He gives three conjectures. First, that it was some ignominy put upon a man: which I thinke no body denies, and it may well stand with our interpretation. Secondly, he saith not that it was a separating of the party *from all company, or society with any man.* (for which Master *Prynne* citeth *Erastus* with others) but a pulling away, or casting out of a man from some particular Towne onely; for instance, from *Nazareth*. Thirdly, He saith, it seemes also to have been a refusall of the priviledges of Jewish Citizens, or the esteeming of one no longer for a true Jew, but for a Proselyte. But that a Proselyte, who was free to come both to Temple and Synagogue (for of such a Proselyte he speaketh expressely) should be said to be made ἀποσυνάγωγος, it may well weaken, it cannot strengthen his cause.

8. In *Tzemach David edit. Hen. Vorst.* pag. 89. We read, that when the *Sanhedrin* did remove from *Hierusalem*, 40. yeeres before the destruction of the Temple, there was a Prayer composed against the Hereticks. *Hen. Vorstius* in his *observ.* pag. 285. sheweth out of *Maimon.* that it was a maledictory Prayer appointed to be used against the Hereticks of that time,

time, who encreaſed mightily: and that *R. Sol. Iarchi* addeth this explanation of the word מינים *Minim, the Diſciples of Jeſus of Nazareth.* D. *Buxtorf. Lexic. Chald. Talm. & rab.* pag. 1201. collecteth that this maledictory Prayer was compoſed in Chriſts time, and againſt his Diſciples. Surely it ſuteth no ſtory ſo well, as that of the decree of caſting out of the Synagogue *Jo.* 12. 42.

After all theſe eight conſiderations, this I muſt adde, that I doe not a little admire, how Maſter *Prynne* could cite *Godwyns* Jewiſh Antiquities *lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. for that opinion, that the caſting out of the Synagogue was not an Eccleſiaſti all but onely a civill cenſure. If he had but looked upon the page immediately preceding, he had found this diſtinction between the Eccleſiaſticall and civill courts of the Jewes; *The office of the Eccleſiaſticall Court, was to put a difference between things holy and unholy, &c. It was a repreſentative Church. Hence is that, dic Eccleſiæ.* Matt. 18. 17. *Tell the Church becauſe unto them, belonged the power of excommunication, the ſeverall ſorts of which cenſure follow*; and ſo he beginneth with the caſting out of the Synagogue, as the firſt or leſſer Excommunication or *Niddui*, and tells us among other effects of it, that the male Children of one thus caſt out were not circumciſed.

To Maſter *Prynnes* fourth exception, the Anſwer may be collected from what is already ſaid. We never find the temporall Magiſtrate called *the Ruler of the Synagogue*, nor yet that he ſate in Judgement in the Synagogue. The beating or ſcourging in the Synagogues, was a tumultuous diſorderly act; we read of no ſentence given, but onely to be put out of the Synagogue, which ſentence was given by the Synagogicall conſiſtory, made up of the Prieſt or Prieſts and Jewiſh Elders. For the power of judging in things and cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, did belong to the Prieſts and Levites, together with the Elders of *Iſrael*, 1 *Chro.* 23. 4. & 26. 30. 32. 2. *Chro.* 19. 8. And therefore what reaſon Maſter *Prynne* had to exclude the Prieſts from this corrective power, and from being Rulers of the Synagogue, I know not. Sure I am the Scriptures cited make Prieſts and Levites to be Judges and Rulers Eccleſiaſticall; of which before. As for the chief Ruler of the Synagogue: *Archyſynagogus erat pri-*

primarius in Synagoga Doctor, say the Centuriſts *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 1. *cap* 7. and if ſo, then not a civill Magiſtrate.

To the fifth. I Anſwer, 1. If there was an excluſion from Reading, Expounding, Preaching, and Prayer, then much more from Sacraments, in which there is more of the communion of Saints. 2. He that was caſt out of the Synagogue might not enter in the Synagogue, ſaith *Menochius* in *Io.* 9.22. therefore he did not communicate in Prayer with the Congregation, nor in other acts of Divine Worſhip, (which how farre it is applicable to excommunication in the Chriſtian Church, I do not now diſpute, nor are all of one opinion, concerning excommunicate perſons, their admiſſion unto ſome, or excluſion from all publike Ordinances, hearing of the word and all) I know *Eraſtus* anſwereth the word *Synagogue* may ſignifie either the materiall houſe, the place of Aſſembling; or the people, the congregation which did Aſſemble; and ſome who differ in Judgement from us in this particular, hold that when we read of putting out of the Synagogue, the word *Synagogue* doth not ſignifie the houſe or place of publike worſhip (which yet it doth ſignifie in other places, as *Luk.* 7.5. *Act.* 18.7.) but the Church or Aſſembly it ſelfe. But I take it to ſignifie both joyntly; and that it was a caſting out, even from the place it ſelfe, ſuch as that *Io.* 9. 34. καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω. *and they caſt him out*, or *excommunicated him*, as the Engliſh Tranſlators adde in the Margine. Beſides, I take what it is granted. It was a caſting out from the Aſſembly, or Congregation it ſelfe. But how could a man be caſt out from the Congregation, and yet be free to come where the Congregation was Aſſembled together? O but he muſt keepe off foure cubites diſtance, from all other men. And was there ſo much roome to reele to and fro in the Synagogue? I doe not underſtand how a man ſhall ſatisfie himſelfe in that notion. But I rather thinke *Bertramus* ſpeakes rationally, that he that was excommunicate by *Niddui* was ſhut out *ab hominum contubernio atque adeò ab ipſius Tabernaculi aditu. de Rep. Iud. cap.* 7. which *Niddui* he takes to be the ſame with caſting out of the Synagogue. He that was caſt out from mens ſociety, muſt needs be excluded from the publike holy Aſſemblies, and from the place where theſe Aſſemblies are. Whereunto agreeth that

which we read in *Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin cap.* 3. *Sect.* 9. a certaine Disciple, having after two and twenty yeeres divulged that which had been said in the Schoole of *R. Ammi*, he was brought out of the Synagogue, and the said *Rabbi* caused it to be proclaimed, this is a revealer of secrets.

3 It is more then Mr. *Prynne* can prove that the Sacrament of Circumcision was not then administred in the Synagogues. The Jewes do administer it in their Synagogues; and that *Iohn* was Circumcised in the Synagogue, some gather from *Luk.* 1. 59. *Venerunt, they came* (to wit to the Synagogue) *to Circumcise the Child*; for my part I lay no weight upon that argument. But I see lesse ground for Mr. *Prynnes* Assertion.

As for that which M. *Prynne* addeth in the close, that those who were cast out of the Synagogue might yet resort to the Temple, he hath said nothing to prove it. I find the same thing affirmed by *Sutlivius de Presbyt.* pag. 25. (though I had thought Master *Prynnes* Tenents of this kind, should never have complyed with those of Episcopall men, against the Anti-Episcopall party) But neither doth *Sutlivius* prove it; onely he holds that the casting out of the Synagogue was meerely a civill Excommunication, and his reason is that which he had to prove, that Christ and his Disciples, when they were cast out of the Synagogues, had notwithstanding a free accesse to the Temple. To my best observation, I can find no Instance of any admitted to the Temple, while cast out of the Synagogue. I turn again to *Erastus* pag. 314. to see whether he proves it. He gives us two instances, first of Christ himselfe who was cast out of the Synagogues, and yet came into the Temple. But how proves he that Christ was ἀποσυνάγωγος? for this, he tells us onely *Quis dubitat? who makes Question of it?* I am one who make a great Question of it, or rather put it out of Question, that Christ was not cast out of the Synagogues; for what saith he himselfe *Io.* 18. 20. *I ever taught in the Synagogue, and in the Temple, whether the Iewes alwayes resort.* Christ was cast out of the City of *Nazareth* in the tumult by the people *Luk.* 4. but here was no consistoriall sentence, it was not the casting out of the Synagogue of which our Question is. The other Instance which *Erastus* gives, helps him as little. The Apostles saith

he,

he, were cast out of the Synagogue, and yet immediately went to the Temple, and taught the people *Act.* 4. *&* 5. And how many Synagogues was *Paul* cast out of? 2 *Cor.* 11. Yet he is not reprehended for coming into the Temple. *Answ.* I find nothing of the Synagogue in those places which he citeth. It was the Councell, not the Synagogue which the Apostles had to doe with Act. 4. *v* 5.

But what have they gained if they could prove that Christ or his Apostles, while knowne to be excommunicate from the Synagogues, were admitted into the Temple? How often did they come into the Temple, when the Priests, and Elders, and *Scribes*, would gladly have cast them out, but they feared the people, and so were restrained? Nay, what if they could give other Instances, that such as were cast out of the Synagogue, were permitted to come into the Temple; what gaine they thereby? If we understand the casting out of the Synagogue to be meant of *Niddui*, of the lesser Excommunication as *Drusius*, *Bertramus*, *Grotius*, and *Godwyne* understand it, we are not at all pinched or straitned. Nay, though we should also comprehend the *Cherem* or greater excommunication under this casting out of the Synagogue, all that will follow upon the admission of such into the Temple, will be this, that excommunicate persons when they desired to make atonement for their sinne by Sacrifice, were for that end admitted into the Temple (which who denies?) but still with a marke of Ignominy upon them as long as they were excommunicated, as I have shewed before. *Chap.* 4. Finally whereas Master *Prynne* concludeth his Discourse of this point, that we may as well prove excommunication from *Diotrephes* 3. *Jo.* 10, as from the casting out of the Synagogue, I admit the paralell thus. The Pharisees did cast out from the Synagogue such as professed Christ; *Diotrephes* did cast out of the Church (as *John* saith) such as received the Brethren. Both *clave errante*: the Ecclesiasticall censure was abused and misapplyed; yet from both it appeareth, that Ecclesiasticall Censures were used in the Church. There was a casting out of the Synagogue used among the Jewes, which the Pharisees did abuse. There was a casting out of the Church used among Christians, which *Diotrephes* did abuse. I remember I heard

Master *Coleman* once draw an argument against excommunication from that Text in *John* concerning *Diotrephes*. Which is as if we should argue thus, the Scripture tells us it is a sinne to condemne the righteous, *Ergo* it is a sinne to condemne. It is a sinne to cast out of the Church godly persons who love and receive the Brethren, *Ergo* it is a sinne to cast out of the Church. A fallacy *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*. The weight is laid upon the application of such a Censure to such persons: An unjust Excommunication is not imitable, but a just Excommunication is imitable according to the warning given us in the words immediately added, *follow not that which is evill, but that which is good.*

CHAP. VII.

Other Scripturall Arguments to prove an Excommunication in the Iewish Church.

ANother Scripture proving Excommunication in the Jewish Church (which is also paralell to that casting out of the Synagogue as *Eraſtus* himselfe told us) is *Ezra*. 10. 8. *that whosoever would not come within three dayes, according to the counsell of the Princes and Elders, all his Substance should be forfeited, and himselfe separated from the Congregation* (or *Church*, It is *Kahal* in the Hebrew, and ἐκκλησία in the Greeke) of those that had been carryed away.

This separation from the Congregation or Church is not meant of banishment, but of Excommunication, as it is interpreted by *Lyra*, *Hugo Cardinalis*, *Cajetan*, *Nicholaus Lombardus*, *Mariana*, *Cornelius a lapide*: of Protestants *Pellicanus*, *Lavater*, *Diodati*, the Dutch Annotations, the late English Annotations; all upon the place. Also by *Zepperus de pol. eccl. lib.* 3. *cap.* 7. and divers others who cite that place occasionally. *Amp-singius disp. adverſ. Anabaptiſt.* pag. 276. doth from that place confute the Anabaptists tenent, that there was no other but a Civill Tribunall in the Jewish Church. *Beda* upon the place cals this Assembly a Synod, *finita Synodo &c.* *Josephus antiq. lib.*

*lib.*11.*cap.*5. expresseth the punishment of those who would not come to *Hierusalem* at that time, thus, ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι μὲν τῶν πλήθους, καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ὑπῶν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ψηφίσεων κείσιν ἀφιερωθησομένης. A double punishment ἀπαλλοτρίωσις and ἀφιέρωσις: the former is referred to the persons themselves, and it signifieth an *abalienation* of those persons from the Congregation, not a banishing or driving of them out of the Land; for ἀπαλλοτριοῦν signifieth to abalienate a person or thing, by renouncing and quitting the right, title, and interest which formerly we had in that person or thing; so houses, lands, persons, &c. are abalienated, when (though they and we remaine where before) we cease to owne them as ours; and thus the Congregation of *Israel* did renounce their interest in those offenders, and would not owne them as Church-members. The other punishment was the dedicating or devoting of their substance. *Gelenius* the Interpreter hath rightly rendered the sence of *Josephus*: *Et quisquis non adfuerat intra præscriptum tempus, ut excommunicetur, bonaque ejus sacro ærario addicantur.* You will object, this separation from the Congregation is coupled together with forfeiture of a mans estate, and so seemeth rather banishment than Excommunication. This objection being taken off, I think there shall be no other difficulty to perplex our interpretation. Wherefore I answer these two things. 1. It is the opinion of divers who hold two Sanhedrins among the Jewes, one Civill, and another Ecclesiasticall; that in causes and occasions of a mixed nature which did concerne both Church and State, both did consult, conclude, and decree, in a joynt way, and by agreement together. Now *Ezra* 10. the Princes, Elders, Priests, and Levites, were assembled together upon an extraordinary cause, which conjuncture and concurrence of the Civill and the Ecclesiasticall power might occasion the denouncing of a double punishment upon the contumacious, *forfeiture* and *excommunication.* But 2. The objection made, doth rather confirme me, that Excommunication is intended in that place. For this forfeiture was ἀφιέρωσις a making sacred, or dedicating to an holy use, as I have shewed out of *Josephus.* The originall word translated *forfeited* is more properly translated *devoted*, which is the word put in the margin of our bookes. The Greek

saith

saith ἀναθεματισθήσεται, *anathematizabitur* which is the best rendring of the Hebrew יֻחָרַם. It was not therefore that which we call *forfeiture* of a mans substance. *Intellige* saith *Grotius*, *ita ut Deo sacra fiat.* And so the excommunication of a man, and *the devoting of his substance as holy to the Lord*, were joyned together: and the substance had not been anathematized if the man had not been anathematized. I doe not say that Excommunication *ex natura rei* doth inferre and draw after it, the devoting of a mans estate as holy to the Lord. No: Excommunication can not hurt a man in his worldly estate, further than the Civill Magistrate and the Law of the Land appointeth. And there was Excommunication in the Apostolical Churches, where there was no Christian Magistrate to adde a Civill mulct. But the devoting of the substance of Excommunicated persons *Ezra* 10. as it had the authority of the Princes and Rulers for it, so what extraordinary warrants or instinct there was upon that extraordinary exigence, we can not tell.

Finally M. *Selden de Jure nat. & Gentium. lib.* 4. *cap.* 9. p. 523. agreeth with *Lud. Capellus* that the separation from the Congregation *Ezra* 10. 8. *plane ipsum est* Ἀποσυνάγωγον *fieri*, *it is the very same with casting out of the Synagogue*, which confuteth further that which M. *Pryme* holds, that the casting out of the Synagogue was not warranted by Gods word, but was onely a humane invention.

I know some have drawne another argument for the Jewish Excommunication from *Nehem.* 13. 25. *I contended with them, and cursed them, id est, anathematizavi & excommunicavi*, saith *C. a lapide* upon the place. So *Tirinus* upon the same place. *Mariana* expounds it, *anathema dixi*. *Aben Ezra* understands it of two kinds of Excommunication, *Niddui* and *Cherem*. For my part, I lay no weight upon this, unlesse you understand the cursing or malediction to be an act of the Ecclesiasticall power, onely authorised or countenanced by the Magistrate: Which the words may well beare: for neither is it easily credible that *Nehemiah* did with his owne hand smite those men and plucke off their hayre, but that by his authority he tooke care to have it done by civill Officers, as the cursing by Ecclesiasticall Officers.

Officers. The Dutch annotations leane this way, telling us that *Nehemiah* did expresse his zeale against them as persons that *deserved to be banned or cut off from the people of God.*

Another Text proving the Jewish Excommunication is *Luke* 6.22. *When they shall separate you, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evill.* It was the most misapplied censure in the world, in respect of the persons thus cast out; but yet it proves the Jewish custome of casting out such as they thought wicked and obstinate persons. This ἀφορισμὸς *Beda* upon the place understandeth of casting out of the Synagogue, *Separent & Synagoga depellant &c.* yet it is a more generall and comprehensive word then the casting out of the Synagogue. It comprehendeth all the three degrees of the Jewish Excommunication, as *Grotius* expounds the place. Which agreeth with *Munsterus Dictionar. Trilingue*, where ἀφορισμὸς is the onely Greeke word given both for the three Hebrew words *Niddui*, *Cherem*, and *Shammata*, and for the Latine *Excommunicatio*. Wherefore ἀφορίζω in this place is *extermino*, *excommunico*, *repudio*, which is one of the usuall significations of the word given by *Stephanus*, and by *Scapula*. It is a word frequently used in the Canons of the most ancient Councels, to expresse such a separation as was a Church-censure, and namely suspension from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. For by the ancient Canons of the Councels, such offences as were punished in a Minister by καθαίρεσις that is deposition, were punished in one of the people by ἀφορισμὸς that is segregation or sequestration. *Zonaras* upon the 13th Canon of the eighth generall Councell, observeth a double ἀφορισμὸς used in the ancient Church: one was a totall separation or casting out of the Church which is usually called Excommunication; another was a suspension or sequestration from the Sacrament onely. Of which I am to speak more afterward in the third Booke. I hold now at the Text in hand, which may be thus read, according to the sence and letter both, *when they shall excommunicate you, &c.* Howbeit the other reading *when they shall separate you*, holds forth the same thing which I speake of; *separate*, from what? our Translators supply *from their company:* but from what company of theirs? not from their

their civill company onely, but from their sacred or Church assemblies, and from religious fellowship, it being a Church-censure and a part of Ecclesiasticall discipline, in which sence, as this word frequently occurreth in the Greeke fathers and ancient Canons when they speake of Church discipline, so doubtlesse it must be taken in this place. 1. Because, as *Grotius* tels us, that which made the Jewes the rather to separate men in this manner from their society was the want of the Civill coercive power of Magistracy, which sometime they had. And I have proved before that the civill Sanhedrin which had power of criminall and capitall judgements did remove from *Jerusalem*, and cease to execute such judgement, forty yeeres before the destruction of the Temple. 2. Because in all other places of the new Testament where the same word is used, it never signifieth a bare separation from civill company, but either a conscientious and religious separation by which Church members did intend to keep themselves pure from such as did walke, (or were conceived to walke) disorderly and scandalously, *Acts* 19.9. 2 *Cor.*6.17. *Gal.* 2. 13. or Gods separating between the godly and the wicked, *Matth* 13.49. & 25.32. or the setting apart of men to the ministery of the Gospell, *Acts* 13.2. *Rom.*1. 1. *Gal.*1.15. Thirdly, a Civill separation is for a Civill injury; but this separation is for wickednesse and impiety, whether accompanied with civill injury or no; *they shall cast out your name as evill*, ὡς πονηρὸν, or as it seemes the Syriak and Arabik interpreters did read ὡς πονηρῶν *tanquam improborum*, *as of wicked and evill men.* The sence is the same.

Thus farre of the Jewish Church, the Jewish Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin, the Jewish Excommunication. I proceed to the Jewish Exomologesis or publike Confession of sinne.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Jewish Exomologesis, or publike Declaration of Repentance by confession of sinne.

AS there were some footsteps of publique Confession among the Heathens, and namely among the *Lacedemonians*: [1] who made him that was deprehended in a crime, to compasse the Altar, and there to expresse his owne shame, and to pronounce some disgracefull words against himselfe. So, I make no doubt, they had this (as many other rites) from an imitation of the people of God, who had their owne Exomologesis, and publique testimonies of Repentance, which may thus appeare.

[1] *Lorinus in Psal.* 31.5. *ex Plutarcho.*

First, a man was to put his hand upon the head of the Sacrifice which he brought, and so it was accepted to make atonement for him, *Lev.* 1.4. and this was done in the Tabernacle publiquely before the Priest. *Genebrardus* and *Lorinus* in *Psalm* 31.5. tell us out of *Aben Ezra* and other Rabbinicall Autors, and *ex libro Siphri*, that when he that brought the Sacrifice, did put his hands between the hornes of the beast which was to be offered, he did distinctly commemorate that sinne for which he did then repent, professing his detestation thereof, and promising to doe so no more. Mr *Ainsworth* on *Levit.* 1.4. to the same purpose citeth out of *Maimony in treat. of offering Sacrifices, cap.* 3. these words. *He layeth his hands between the two hornes, and confesseth upon the same offering, the iniquity of sinne, and upon the trespasse-offering, the iniquity of trespasse: and upon the burnt offering he confesseth the iniquity of doing that which he should not, and not doing that he ought, &c.* Now that confession of sinne was joyned with the laying on of hands upon the Sacrifice, is not onely proved by the judgement of the Hebrews, understanding the Law in that sence, but by the Law it selfe, *Lev.* 16.21. where *Aaron* is commanded to lay his hands upon the head of the live Goat, *and confesse over him all the iniquites*

of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sinnes, putting them upon the head of the Goat.

Secondly, the Law appointeth confession to be made at the bringing of Trespasse-offerings *Levit.*5. and that in three kinds of trespasses.

1 If one *heare the voyce of swearing*, that is, heare his neighbour swearing or cursing, which he ought to reveale : *and is a witnesse whether he hath seen or known of it :* (that is, whether he himselfe hath been present at the cursing or reviling (of God *Levit.*24.10,11. or of man, 2 *Sam.*16.7.) or hath heard it by relation from others, and knowne it that way. So the Dutch Annotations and the best Interpreters) *if he doe not utter it, then he shall beare his iniquity.* The meaning is when one doth for favour or malice (So *Aretius* and *Pareus* upon the place) dissemble the truth, and conceale his knowledge, and so make himselfe partaker of other mens sinnes. *Grotius* expounds it by *Prov.*29. *Who so is partner with a thiefe hateth his owne soule : he heareth a cursing and bewrayeth it not.* In such a case a man did greatly scandalize all those (were they more or fewer) who knew his dissimulation, and that he did not utter his knowledge.

2 If one had touched any uncleane thing, and not being cleansed from his uncleannesse [m] did goe into the Sanctuary or touch an holy thing (whether he knew himselfe to have touched the uncleane thing, when he went into the Sanctuary, but did afterward forget it, as the Hebrews understand the place; or whether he did not know of his uncleannes when he went into the Sanctuary) as soon as it was revealed to him by others who did take offence at it, or otherwise brought to his knowledge, he was held guilty till confession and atonement was made. It was not simply the touching of an uncleane thing, for which the confession and trespasse-offering was appointed : *Seeing the Law* (saith *Ainsworth*) *maketh such uncleane but till evening Lev.*11.24,31. *when washing themselves and their clothes they were cleane, and for uncleannesse by a dead man, the sprinkling water cleansed them, Num.*19.17,18,19. Wherefore he resolveth out of the Hebrew Doctors, that this confession of sinne, and the trespasse-offering was required in case an uncleane person in

[m] See *Ainsworth* upon the place.

in his uncleanneſſe came to the Sanctuary, or did eate of an holy thing.

3 If one had ſworne unadviſedly, as *David*, 1 *Sam.*25.22. *Herod*, *Mark* 6.23. thoſe conſpirators againſt *Paul*, *Acts* 23.21. (which are the examples given in the Dutch Annotations, and they are examples of ſcandals) if the thing were hid from him, through the diſtemper, impetuoſity, and paſſion of his ſpirit, overclouding the eye of his mind, ſo that when he hath ſworn a ſcandalous oath, he ſcarce knowes or remembers well the thing. Or thus; If a man had ſworne an oath to doe a thing, or not to doe it, and afterward falſified his oath, either becauſe he could not doe what he had raſhly ſworne, or becauſe he was unwilling to doe it, or becauſe he neglected to doe it: (*Aretius* puts this triple caſe in expounding the Text:) When a man was brought to the knowledge of the falſifying of his oath, *being told, or put in mind of it by others*, ſaith *Diodati*, which was alſo a caſe of ſcandall.

In any of theſe three caſes, a man was to confeſſe his ſinne, when he brought his treſpaſſe-offering, and the offering was not accepted without confeſſion: *Lev.*5.5. *And it ſhall be, when he ſhall be guilty in one of theſe things, that he ſhall confeſſe that he hath ſinned in that thing. And he ſhall bring his treſpaſſe offering, &c.* [n] This confeſſion was made in the Prieſts hearing, and not to God alone, as Mr *Prynne* affirmeth *Vindic.* pag.17. For, 1. It was a cereomoniall Law, concerning the externall worſhip of God, and a part of the Law of treſpaſſe-offerings. He might as well have ſaid, that the Treſpaſſe-offering was made to God alone, without the preſence of the Prieſt or any other. 2. He himſelfe doth not deny (but intimate) that till ſuch confeſſion was made, a man was not admitted to make atonement by treſpaſſe-offerings. And ſo doe the Jewes underſtand the Law of confeſſion, as we ſhall heare by and by. Now how could it be knowne, whether a man had confeſſed any thing at all, if it was ſecretly, and to God alone? 3. The ſinnes to be confeſſed, were oft times ſcandalous and knowne to others, (as hath been cleared.) Therefore the confeſſion was to be knowne to others alſo. 4 That this confeſſion (not private and auricular, but publique and penitentiall) was made in the Temple,

[n] *Bucer. ſcripta Anglicana*, pag. 310. Nunc autem legimus, Lev. 4,5. & 6. Deum populo ſuo ordinaſſe ac mandaſſe: ſi quos de populo, de ſacerdotibus, aut principibus, aut ſi etiam populus univerſus aliquid fortè deliquiſſet contra mandata ſua, ſeu faciendo quæ ipſe vetuerat, ſeu omittendo quæ præceperat; ut tales ante ſe in eccleſia ſua, & coram ſacerdote comparerent, ibi peccatum ſuum confiterentur, veniam perent, oblationes ſuas offerrent, & hoc modo per ſacerdotem reconciliationem conſequerentur. idque haud dubiè non abſque ſeria humiliatione, planctu, & jejunio.

before and in the hearing of the Priest, I prove from *Philo* the Jew. In his booke *de sacr. Abelis & Caini*, at the close, speaking of the Levites ministery, he saith, that he did execute and performe λειτουργίας ἁπάσας, all those services which belong to a perfect Priesthood, and to the bringing of man to God, whether by burnt-offerings, ἢ διὰ μετανοίας ἁμαρτημάτων *aut pro peccatis quorum pœnitet* saith *Gelenius* the Interpreter, meaning the trespasse-offerings. But observe further, he speaks of the penitentiall part, as a publique thing, or rather of the publique declaration of repentance. Repentance of sinnes, that is, repentance declared or professed (which was in the confession joyned with the trespasse-offerings) was one of the chiefe things about which the Leviticall ministery was exercised: which is the cleare sence of the place. More plainly, the same *Philo lib. de victimis* towards the close, where he tels that certaine parts of the trespasse-offerings were eaten by the Priests, and that these must be eaten in the Temple, he gives this reason for it, lest the penitents sinne and shame should be divulged and punished more then needs must, which intimateth that the particular offence was so confessed that it was made knowne to such as were within the Temple.

The third Scripturall proofe is *Num.* 5.6,7. *When a man or a woman shall commit any sinne that men commit, to doe a trespasse against the Lord, and that person be guilty, Then they shall confesse their sinne which they have done: and he shall recompence his trespasse, &c.* The Hebrews expound it thus: *All the precepts in the Law, whether they command or forbid a thing, if a man transgresse against any one of them, either presumptuously or ignorantly, when he maketh repentance and turneth from his sinne, he is bound to confesse before the blessed God, as in Numb.* 5.7. *This confession is with words, and it is commanded to be done. How doe they confesse? He saith, Oh God, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have trespassed before thee, and have done thus and thus: and loe I repent, and am ashamed of my doings: and I will never doe this thing againe. And this is the foundation of confession. And who so maketh a large confession, and is long in this thing, he is to be commended. And so the owners of sinne and trespasse-offerings, when they bring their oblations for their ignorant or for their presumptuous sinnes:*

sinnes: atonement is not made for them by their oblation, untill they have made Repentance and Confession by word of mouth. Likewise all condemned to death by the Magistrates, or condemned to Stripes, no atonement is made for them by their death, or by their Stripes, untill they have repented and confessed. And so he that hurteth his Neighbour, or doth him dammage, though he pay him whatsoever he oweth him, atonement is not made for him, tell he confesse and turne away from doing so againe for ever, as it is written in Num. 5. 6. *Any of all the sinnes of men.* All this *Ainsworth* transcribeth out of *Maimony in Misn. treat. of Repentance*, Chap. 1. *Sect.* 1. See also the Latin Edition of the Jewish Canons of Repentance Printed at *Cambridge Ann.* 1631. Where beside that passage in the first Chapter, concerning the necessity of confessing by word of mouth, that sinne for which the Trespasse offering was brought, you have another plaine passage, *cap.* 2. for (o) publike confession (not of private sinnes known to God onely, but) of known sinnes by which others were scandalized.

(o) Eximia laus est pœnitentiam agenti, ut publicè confiteatur, iniquitates suas toti cœtui indicans, & delicta quæ in proximum admisit, aliis aperiens hunc in modum. Revera peccavi in N. N. (virum nominans) & hæc vell illa feci: Ecce autem me vobis nunc convertor, & me facti pœnitet. Qui vero præ superbia non indicat, sed abscondit iniquitates suas, illi perfecta non est pœnitentia: quia dicitur, Qui abscondit scelera sua, non dirigetur. Hæc dicta intelligenda sunt de peccatis quæ in proximum admittuntur. Verum in transgressionibus quæ sunt hominis in Deum, non necesse est cuiquam seipsum propalare: Quin imò perfrictæ frontis est, illiusmodi peccata revelare: Sed in conspectu Dei pœnitentiam agit, & coram illo peccata hæc speciatim recenset.

In which passage I nnderstand by sinnes against God, sinnes known to God onely. 1. Because its forbidden to reveale those sinnes, therefore they were secret. 2. Because otherwise those Canons shall contradict themselves, for *cap.* 1. it's told us that all who brought trepasse offerings, were bound to confesse by word of mouth, the sinne which they had done, without which confession, they got not leave to make atonement by the trespasse-offering. Now trespasse offerings were for sinnes against God as well as for sinnes against man. 3. It should otherwise contradict the Law *Num.* 5. 6. which appointeth any sinne or trespasse against the Lord to be confessed. 4. Those trespasses were to be publikely confessed, for which in case of impenitency and obstinacy, a man was excommunicated with

Cherem, or the greater Excommunication. But a man was excommunicated for divers ſinnes againſt God, which did not at all wrong his Neighbour, ſetting a ſide the ſcandall. Which I have proved before. Theſe four reaſons will prove either that the meaning of that Canon muſt be of private ſinnes, and not of publike and ſcandalous ſinnes againſt the firſt Table: or otherwiſe that the Canon is contrary to and inconſiſtent with both Scripture, Reaſon, and other Rabbinnicall writings.

From the Law *Num.* 5. thus explained, obſerve concerning the Confeſſion of ſinne. 1. It was for any ſcandalous ſinne, of commiſſion or omiſſion againſt the firſt or ſecond Table. 2. It was not free and voluntary to the offender. I doe not ſay that he was compelled to it by any externall Force or coercive power: but he was commanded and obliged by the Law to confeſſe; *Vatablus* on *Num.* 5. 7. *Fatebuntur* i. e. *tenebuntur fateri, they ſhall confeſſe, that is, they ſhall be bound to confeſſe*: and a man was not admitted with his treſpaſſe offering except he confeſſed. 3. It was done by word of mouth. 4. And publikely before the Congregation that were preſent. 5. (p) The particular treſpaſſe was named in the Confeſſion. 6. Sinnes both of Ignorance and Malice, when ſcandalous, were to be confeſſed. 7. The ſinner was not ſtinted to a Preſcript forme of words in Confeſſion, but was to enlarge his confeſſion, as his heart was enlarged. 8. In Criminall and Capitall caſes, beſide the civill or corporall puniſhment, confeſſion was to be made, becauſe of the ſcandall which had been given. Which doth further appeare from the *Talmud* it ſelfe in *Sanhedrin. cap.6.Sect.2. for that is obſerved in all who are put to death, that they muſt confeſſe; for whoever doth confeſſe he hath part in the world to come; and namely it is recorded of* Achan, *that* Joſhua *ſaid to him, my Sonne give now Glory to the Lord God of* Iſrael, *and make confeſſion unto him; And* Achan *anſwered, Indeed, I have ſinned againſt the Lord God of* Iſrael, *and thus and thus &c. Whence is it collected that his confeſſion did expiate his ſinne. And* Joſhua *ſaid, why haſt thou troubled us? God ſhall trouble thee this day. This day thou ſhalt be troubled, not in the world to come.* The like you read of *Achan* in *Pirke R. Elieſer* cap. 38. I know *Achans* confeſſion was not in the Sanctuary, nor at a Treſpaſſe offering. But I make mention of it becauſe (q) *Eraſtus*

(p) *Hanc confeſſionem Hebræi vocant confeſſionem ſuper peccato ſingulari, quia in aliis ſacrificiis fiebat confeſſio peccatorum generalis,* ſaith *Vatablus* upon the place.

(q) *Confirm. Theſ.* pag. 106. 113.

ſtus holdeth that under the Law, confeſſion was onely required in ſuch caſes, where the ſinne was not criminall or capitall. Which is confuted by the afore-mentioned paſſages in *Maimonides* and the *Talmud* it ſelfe: proving that whether the ſinne was expiated by Sacrifice or by death, it was alwayes to be confeſſed; from the ſame example of *Achan* doth *P.* (r) *Galatinus lib.* 10. *cap.* 3. prove that Declaration of repentance was to be made by word of mouth, and that the ſinne was to be particularly confeſſed, which he further proveth by another rabbinicall paſſage.

(r) Ex eo quod in libro Joma, id eſt, dierum, in capite, jom hakippurim, id eſt, dies propitiationum, ita ſcribitur. Dixit Rab. Hunna: Omnis qui tranſgreſſione tranſgreſſus eſt, neceſſe eſt ut ſingulatim exprimat peccatum.

In the fourth place, *Jo.* 9. 24. ſeemeth to hold forth a judiciall publike confeſſion of ſinne to have been required of ſcandalous ſinners. The Phariſees being upon an examination of him that was born blind, and was made to ſee, they labour to drive him ſo farre from confeſſing Chriſt, as to confeſſe ſinne and wicked colluſion, *Give God the Praiſe* ſay they, *we know that this man is a ſinner.* Which is to be expounded by *Joſ.* 7. 19. *Give glory to the Lord God of Iſrael, and make confeſſion.*

Fifthly, as the Jewes had an Excommunication, ſo they had an abſolution, and that which interveened was Confeſſion and Declaration of Repentance. And hence came the *Arabik* נדם *nadam, he hath repented*; and נאדם *nadim a penitent*, the *Niddui* made the *nadim*: for when a man was excommunicated by the leſſer Excommunication, (s) the Conſiſtory waited firſt 30. dayes, and then other 30. dayes, and as ſome thinke (the third time) 30. dayes, to ſee whether the offender were penitent, (which could not be known without confeſſion) and would ſeek abſolution: which if he did not, but continued obſtinate & impenitent, then they proceeded to the greater excommunication. Which doth prove a publike Confeſſion, at leaſt in the caſe of the excommunicated.

(s) *Seld. de jure nat. & Gentium lib.* 4. cap. 8. Pro diverſitate peccati & peccantis moribus, nunc citius nunc ſerius ſequebatur abſolutio. Sed ut plurimum excommunicatio fiebat in diem triceſimum &c. Intra hoc tempus exſpectabat forum ut ad Bonam rediret. mentem, reſipiſceret, & quæ juberent ipſi præſtaret &c. Poſt trignta dierum contumaciam, idem tempus ſemel iterabatur &c. At vero ſi neque intra id ſpatii pœnitens abſolutionem peteret, τῶ *Cherem* ſeu Anathemate feriebatur.

Sixthly, we find a publike penitentiall confeſſion *Ezra.* 10. 10. 11. *And Ezra the Prieſt ſtood up and ſaid unto them, ye have tranſgreſſed*

gressed and have taken strange wives to encrease the trespasse of Israel. *Now therefore make confession unto the Lord God of your Fathers, and doe his pleasure, and separate your selves from the people of the land, and from the strange wives.* Marke here the forsaking of the sinne could not suffice without confessing the sinne. All *Israel* had sworne and covenanted to doe the thing, to put away the strange wives *vers.* 5. But *Ezra* the Priest tells them they must also make confession of their sinne; confession of their former trespasse must be joyned with Reformation for the future: All which the people promise to doe as *Ezra* had said vers. 12. But what was this confession? was it onely a private confession to God alone? or was it onely a generall confession made by the whole congregration of *Israel* at a solemne Fast and humiliation? Nay, that there was a third sort of Confession differing from both these, appeareth by *vers.* 13. *neither is this a worke of one day or two: for we are many that have transgressed in this thing*; yea, three Moneths are spent in the businesse, *vers.* 16, 17. during which space, all that had taken strange wives, came at appointed times out of every City, and were successively examined by *Ezra* the Priest and certaine chiefe of the Fathers and Levites, (such of both, as were not themselves guilty) before whom such as were found guilty did make Confession: The Sons of the Priests made Confession as well as others, yea, with the first; *and gave their hands, that they would put away their wives: and being guilty, they offerered a Ram of the Flock for their trespasse.* With which trespasse offering confession was ever joyned, as hath been before shewed from the Law.

Seventhly, Master *Hildersham* of worthy memory in his 34. Lecture upon *Psal.* 51. draweth an Argument from *Davids* example for the publike Confession of a scandalous sinne before the Church, *He made*, saith he, *publike Confession of his sinne to the Congregation and Church of God; for we see in the Title of this Psalme.* 1 *That he committed this Psalme (that containeth the acknowledgement of his sinne, and profession of his repentance) to the chief musitian to be published in the Sanctuary and Temple.* 2 *That in this publication of his Repentance, he hideth not from the Church his sinne, nor cloketh it at all, but expresseth in particular the speciall sinne, &c.* Adde hereunto, this publike Confession was made after

after miniſteriall conviction by *Nathan*, who did convince *David* of the greatneſſe of that ſcandalous ſinne, in which he had then continued impenitent neer a yeer or thereabout. The Doctrin which Maſter *Hilderſham* draweth from *Davids* example is this, *That they whoſe ſinnes God hath detected and brought to light, whoſe ſinnes are publike and notorious, ſcandalous and offenſive to the congregations where they live, ought to be willing to confeſſe their ſins publikely, to make their Repentance as publike and notorious as their ſinne is.* He addeth in his explanation, *when they ſhall be required to doe it by the Diſcipline of the Church.* Marke one of his applications (which is the Subject of the 37. Lecture) *The ſecond ſort that are to be reproved by this Doctrine, are ſuch as having authority to enjoyne publike Repentance to ſcandalous ſinners, for the ſatisfying of the Congregation, when they are detected and preſented unto them, refuſe or neglect to doe it.* And here he complaineth, that the publike acknowledgement of ſcandalous ſinnes, was grown out of uſe, and that though it was ordered by authority, yet it was not put in execution. *The Canons of our Church* (ſaith he) can. 26. *ſtraightly charge every Miniſter*, That he ſhall not in any wiſe admit to the Communion, any of his flock which be openly known to live in ſinne notorious without Repentance. *And the Booke of Common Prayer in the rubrike before the Communion, commandeth*, that if any be an open and notorious evill liver, ſo that the Congregation by him is offended, the Miniſter ſhall call him, and advertiſe him in any wiſe, not to preſume to the Lords Table, till he hath openly declared himſelf, to have truly repented, that the Congregation may thereby be ſatisfied, which were afore offended. *So that you may ſee the Lawes and Diſcipline of our Church, require that open and ſcandalous ſinners ſhould doe open and publike Repentance, yea, give power to the Miniſter to repell and keepe back ſuch from the Communion that refuſe to doe it.* Where it may be obſerved by the way, that the Power of Elder-ſhips for ſuſpending ſcandalous perſons (not Excommunicated) from the Sacrament, now ſo much contented againſt by Maſter *Prynne*, is but the ſame Power which was granted by authority to the Miniſtery, even in the prelaticall times. And he hath upon the matter endeavoured to bring the Conſciences of a whole Elder-ſhip into a greater

ſervitude under this preſent Reformation, then the Conſcience of a ſingle Miniſter was formerly brought under by Law in this particular.

Eighthly, Maſter *Hilderſham Ibid. Lect.* 34. argueth not onely *à pari*, but *à fortiori*. If a neceſſity of ſatisfying an offended Brother, how much more a neceſſity of ſatisfying an offended Church, which will equally hold both for the old and new Teſtament? His owne words are very well worth the tranſcribing. *This is evident by thoſe two Laws Lev.* 6. 5. 6. and *Num.* 5. 6. 8. *where God plainly taught his people, that their treſpaſſe offering which they brought to him, to ſeeke pardon of any ſinne, whereby they had wronged any man, ſhould not be accepted, till they had firſt made ſatisfaction to the party to whom the wrong was done. And leſt we ſhould thinke thoſe Lawes concerned the Iewes onely, our Saviour himſelfe giveth this in charge* Matth. 5.23.24. If thou bringeſt thy Gift to the Altar, and there remembreſt that thy Brother hath ought againſt thee: leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift. *And if there be ſuch neceſſity of making ſatisfaction to any one Brother that hath ought againſt us, before we can get aſſurance of our reconciliation with God, what neceſſity is there of making ſatisfaction to a whole Church and Congregation, that we have given juſt cauſe of offence unto? In this caſe it is not ſufficient to approve our Repentance and truth of heart to God; we muſt be willing alſo and deſirous to approve it to the Congregation and Church of God, that we may ſay as the two Tribes and halfe ſaid,* Joſh. 22. The Lord God of Gods he knoweth, and *Iſrael* he ſhall know. Thus Maſter *Hilderſham.*

CHAP. IX.

CHAP. IX.

Whether in the Iewiſh Church, there was any Suſpenſion or excluſion of prophane, ſcandalous, notorious ſinners, from partaking in the publike Ordinances, with the reſt of the Children of Iſrael *in the Temple.*

ERaſtus and his followers hold, that among the Jewes none was excluded from any publike Ordinance in the Temple, for morall uncleaneſſe, that is, for a prophane ſcandalous converſation, but onely for legall or ceremoniall uncleaneſſe. The like Maſter *Prynne* ſaith of the Paſſeover, and of the Temple he holds that even thoſe who were for their offences caſt out of the Synagogues, were yet free to come and did come to the Temple. I ſhall particularly make Anſwer both to *Eraſtus* and to Maſter *Prynne* in this point, when they ſhall fall in my way afterward. I ſhall here, more generally endeavour to rectifie their great miſtake, and to prove an excluſion from the Temple and publike Ordinances, for publike and ſcandalous offences in life and converſation, or for morall as well as ceremoniall uncleaneſſe.

(t) Offerenti victimas lex præcipit, ut purus ſiat corpore ac animo. *Et infra.* Neceſſum eſt igitur adituros Templum ſacrum gratia, & corpore nitidos eſſe, & multo magis anima. &c. nam veri Dei Templum non patet prophanis ſacrificiis. Τὸ γὰρ τῷ ὄντως ὄντος ἱερὸν ἀνιέροις ἄβατον

Firſt, I ſhall prove it *ex ore duorum*, from the Teſtimonies of two of the moſt famous witneſſes of the Jewes themſelves, *Philo* and *Joſephus*. (t) *Philo lib de Victimas offerentibus*, is ſo full

θυσίαις.) *Et poſt.* an dubium eſt, neque legem quicquam ab injuſtis, neque ſolem à tenebris accipere? *Et verſus finem.* Cæterum quia ſocietatem humanitatemque (κοινωνίας δὲ καὶ φιλανθρωπίας) maximè docet lex noſtra, utrique virtuti honorem habet meritum, neminem deplorate malum ad eas admittens, ſed quàm longiſſimè in rem malam ablegans. Cum igitur ſciret concionibus (ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις) admiſceri multos improbos, quòd ſe poſſe in turba latere autument, ut id caveret in poſterum, omnes indignos à ſacro cœtu edicto prohibint (προαναίρεῖ πάντας τοὺς ἀναξίους ἱερᾶς συλλόγου) incipiens à ſemiviris obſcæno morbo laborantibus, qui naturæ monetam adulterantes, in impudicarum mulierum affectum & formam ſponte degenerant. Spadones item & caſtratos arcet &c. Pariter repellit non tantum ſcorta, ſed & natos è proſtitutis, contactos materno dedecore propter natales adulterinos. &c. Alii vero quaſi contendant hos in impietatis ſtadio poſt ſe relinquere, addunt amplius, ut non ſolùm ideas, ſed & deum eſſe negent. *Et poſt.* Proinde omnes hi meritò pelluntur à ſacris cœtibus, (διὸ πάντας εἰκότως ἱεροῦ συλλόγου ἐλαύνει.)

and plaine, as if he had purposely written that Booke to record the exclusion of scandalous persons from Communion with the Church of *Israel* in the Temple. He presseth all along the necessity of holinesse and purity in those who bring Sacrifices, and tells us that their Law did exclude from their holy Assemblies meretricious persons, despisers of God, and all that were known to be impious and prophane, as well as those who were legally uncleane.

The same thing may be confirmed out of *Iosephus*, (u) who records that one *Simon* a Doctor of the Law, did in the absence of King *Agrippa*, accuse him to the people as an impure unworthy man, who ought not be suffered to enter into the Temple. *Iosephus* gives a good Testimony to *Agrippa*, that he was unjustly accused. *Agrippa* himselfe sends for *Simon*, and askes him what he had ever done which deserved such an accusation. But neither *Agrippa* himselfe, nor *Iosephus*, saith one syllable to this purpose, that the excluding of a man from the Temple for prophaneneſse and impiety was a new Arbitrary censure, contrary to the law or custome of the Jewes: which (no doubt) they had done, if there had been any ground for them to say so. Their very pleading of innocency, and no more, tacitely confirmeth that if guilty, it had been just to exclude from the Temple. Againe *de bello Jud. lib.* 4. *cap.* 5. *Iosephus* records that *Ananus* the high Priest (whom *cap.* 7. He highly commends for good government) had an oration to the Jewes against the ζηλωταὶ, the zelots, who under colour of that name, which they took to themselves, committed a great deale of injustice and violence. He said with tears, *I had rather dye then see the house of God filled* πσότους ἄγεσι *with such crimes* (or criminall persons) καὶ τὰς ἁγίας καὶ ἁγίας χώρας ποσὶ μιαιφόνων σεσχωρημένας, *and the forbidden and holy places to be haunted and trode with the feet of those who are polluted with murthers:* speaking of those zelots. What can be more plaine; τὸ ἄγος, a piacular crime, was a cause of keeping back from the Temple (even as also among the Heathens, some were for piacular crimes interdicted the Sacrifices) μιαφονία, blood-guiltinesse, defilement by murther, was also a cause of exclusion from the Temple, and to such the Temple was a place inaccessible and forbidden. I adde a Testi-

(u) *Antiq. lib.* 19. *cap.* 7. libenter & continuò degebat (*Agrippa*) Hierosolymis, institutorum ac rituum patriæ servator religiosissimus, purus enim erat â contaminamentis omnibus, nec ulla dies ei præteribat absque sacrificio. Accidit aliquando ut quidam Hierosolymita legis peritus, nomine Simon, advocata concione, per regis absentiam, agentis tum Cæsareæ, criminaretur illum ut impurum & arcendum templi aditu, quod non nisi dignis pateat. Id ubi præfectus urbis illi significarit per literas, confestim accersivit hominem &c. Dic mihi inquit, quid tibi non probatur ex his quæ facimus.

mony

mony of *J. Scaliger Elench. Trihæres. Nic. Terar. cap.* 28. where speaking of those *Essæans* who did not observe the Mosaicall rites, he saith, *Itaque non mirum, si tanquam ἐξαγεῖς & piaculares aditu Templi prohibebantur.* The like *Constantinus l' Empereur annot. in Cod. Middoth pag* 44. proves from another passage in *Josephus: viri autem qui non per omnia casti essent ab interiori aula prohibebantur.* Where *l' Empereur* addeth, *In spacii descripti partem interiorem non admittebant quoque hæreticum:* which he saith may be proved out of the Talmud. *Quis enim dicat* (saith *Hen. Vorstius, animad. in Pirke* pag. 169.) *apostatam, blasphemum, aliaque sacra capita intra Templum fuisse admissa.* Of the exclusion of excommunicate persons I have before spoken, following their opinion who hold, that such as were excommunicate by the lesser Excommunication or *Niddui*, had liberty to come into the Temple, yet so that they were to enter in at the gate of the mourners, and were not seen in the Temple, but as penitents: but such as were excommunicated by the greater Excommunication or *Cherem* were not suffered to come into the Temple, nor so much as into any assembly of ten men, and they might neither teach nor be taught. x *Grotius* holds that such as were excommunicated by *Niddui* or the lesser Excommunication had power to come to the Temple, but no otherwise then Heathens, and that they might not come into the Court of *Israel:* which is an answer to *M. Prynnes* objection, that such as were cast out of the Synagogue came to the Temple.

There are but two places in the new Testament, which seem at first to make much against that which I have said. One is, *Luke* 18. concerning the Publicans going up to the Temple to pray, as well as the Pharisee. The other is *John* 8. concerning the woman taken in adultery, whom they brought before Christ in the Temple. I remember y *Erastus* objecteth them both.

To the first I answer, it rather confirmeth then confuteth what I have said. For 1. The Text saith, Vers. 13. *the Publican stood afarre off*: the Pharisee not so. z *Grotius* upon the place, Verse 11. noteth, that the Pharisees fault was not in this particular, that he came further into the Temple then the Publican: for the custome was such, that the Publicans were to stand in the Court of the Gentiles, the Pharisees in the Court of

x *Annot. in Luk.* 6. 22. Qui hac nota (minoris ἀφορισμοῦ sive Niddui) inusti erant, stante Templo, accedebant ad Templum, ut ex Hebræis vir doctus notavit: sed haud dubiè consistebant extra τὸ θεολόγιον qui distinguebat ἐθνικὸς ab Israelitis. Nam οἱ ἀφορισμῶν interim ἐθνικῶν loco habebantur.

y *Confirm Thes. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2. pag. 99. and elsewhere.

z Nam mos id ferebat ut Publicani in atrio Gentilium, Pharisæi in atrio Israelitarum starent, nec quicquam in eo erat insolitum aut Pharisæo imputandum.

of *Israel. Camer. myroth. in Luke* 18. is also of opinion that the Publican stood in the Court of the Gentiles, or in that first Court into which *Josephus lib.* 2. *contra Appion.* saith, that all, even Heathens, might come. 2. And though our opposites could prove, that the Publican came into the Court of *Israel*, (which they will never be able to doe) yet this place helpes them not at all, unlesse they can prove that this was a scandalous and prophane Publican. It is certaine that divers of the Publicans were religious and devout men, and that this was one of them, we may more then conjecturally know, by the Pharisees owne words, for when he hath thanked God, that he is not as other men, adulterers, unjust, extortioners, he addeth with a disjunction, *or even as this Publican*, thus preferring himselfe not onely to the infamous and scandalous Publicans, but even to this devout Publican. More of this place afterward, in the debate of *Matth.* 18.

To the other objection from *John* 8.2,3. where it is said that the Pharisees brought a woman taken in adultery into the Temple, and set her before Christ; First, I answer with [a] *Const. l' Empereur annot. in Cod. Middoth cap.* 2. *pag.* 45. by the Temple, in that place, we are to understand the *Intermurale*, the utter Court, or Court of the Gentiles, which was without the Court of *Israel*, which utter Court (saith he) both the Evangelists and *Josephus* call by the name of ἱερὸν the Temple. Yea the whole mountaine of the Temple, even comprehending that part of it which was without the *Intermurale*, had the name of the Temple, as M. *Selden* noteth *de Jure nat. & Gent. l.* 3. *c.* 6. *p.* 298. And *lib.* 4. *cap.* 5. he expounds that of the Money-changers *in the Temple*, to be meant of the court of the Gentiles. This answer doth the better agree to *John* 8. because V. 2. tels us, it was in the place where *all the people came unto Jesus, and he taught them.* Now it is certaine that both Christ and his Apostles did often teach the people in the Coutt of the Gentiles, and in *Solomons* porch, which was without the Court of *Israel*, in the *Intermurale*, that all might have the better occasion of hearing the Gospell, even they who were not permitted to enter into the Court of *Israel*. Wherefore since the Text tels us, that when the Pharisees brought the woman to Christ, he was teaching in such a place, where

[a] Sanè cum Servator in Templo docuisse cap. 8. Joh. legitur, quò mulierem deprehensam Pharisæi ipsi adduxerunt; alium locum præter hunc qui erat extra atria, designari credere nequeo: quandequidem è Josepho observatum jam fuit, impuris atria adire fas non fuisse.

where *all the people* had acceſſe to heare him: this agreeth better to the *Intermurale*, then to the Court of *Iſrael*. *Secondly*, I anſwer, that woman did not come as a priviledged perſon, free to come and worſhip in the Court of *Iſrael*, with the Church of *Iſrael*; but ſhe is brought as an accuſed perſon, that in the moſt publique and ſhamefull manner ſhe might be ſentenced and condemned, and made vile before all the people: ſo that it was in her *pœna, non privilegium.* [b] The Sanhedrin alſo did ſit in the Temple, ſo that ſuch as were to be examined and judged, muſt be brought to that place where the Sanhedrin was, which ſate in that part of the Temple that was called *Gazith*. This might be the occaſion of bringing ſome to the Temple as parties to be judged, who were not admitted to the Ordinances of worſhip in the Court of *Iſrael*. Even as the prohibition of reading atheiſticall or hereticall bookes, *Sanhedrin cap.* 11. *ſect.* 1. was not violated by the Councels reading or ſearching of them for a Judiciall triall and examination: as is rightly obſerved by *Dionyſius Voſſius, annot. in Maimon. de Idol.* pag. 25.

[b] *P. Cuneus de repub. Hebr. lib. 1. cap. 12. Concilii magni ſedes in ipſo Sanctuario fuit.*

And now having taken off the two principall objections, we ſhall take notice of ſuch Scriptures as either directly, or at leaſt by conſequence prove, that notorious and ſcandalous ſinners were not allowed to be admitted into the Temple, and partake in all the ordinances.

1. God reproveth not onely the bringing of ſtrangers into his Sanctuary, who were uncircumciſed in the fleſh, but the bringing of thoſe who were uncircumciſed in heart, that is, known to be ſuch, for *de ſecretis non judicat Eccleſia*, *Ezech.* 44. 7, 9. Such ought not to have had fellowſhip in the holy things. *No ſtranger uncircumciſed in fleſh, ſhall enter into my Sanctuary, of any ſtranger that is among the children of Iſrael.* It is a law concerning *proſelytus domicilii*, ſuch proſelytes as having renounced idolatry, and profeſſing to obſerve the ſeven precepts given to the ſonnes of *Noah*, were thereupon permitted to dwell and converſe among the children of *Iſrael*. (Of which more elſewhere.) Such a one ought not be admitted into the Sanctuary, or place of the holy aſſemblies, there to pertake in all the Ordinances with the Church, unleſſe he be both circumciſed in fleſh, and

and also in regard of his profession and practice a visible Saint, or one supposed to be circumcised in heart. The disjunction *Nor* tels us that if he were either uncircumcised in flesh, or known to be uncircumcised in heart, God did not allow him to be admitted to cõmunion with the children of *Israel* in al publik ordinances.

2. There is a Law, *Deut.* 23.18. forbidding to bring the hire of a whore into the house of the Lord: and that because it was the price of a whore; how much more was it contrary to the will of God, that the whore her selfe, being knowne to be such, should be brought to the house of the Lord? For *propter quod unumquodque est tale, id ipsum est magis tale.* This argument is hinted by [c] *Philo* the Jew.

3. The Lord sharply contendeth with those who did steale, murther, and commit adultery, and sweare falsely, and burne Incense to *Baal*, and yet presumed to come and stand before him in his owne house. *Is this house which is called by my name, saith the Lord, become a den of robbers in your eyes? Jerem.* 7.9,10,11. A den of robbers is the place which receives robbers; and (saith *Vatablus* upon the place) as robbers after their robbing come to their denne, so doe these even after their stealing, murthering, &c. come to the Temple. To the same purpose is that challenge *Ezech.* 23.38,39. *Moreover this they have done unto me, they have defiled my Sanctuary in the same day, and have prophaned my Sabbaths. For when they had slaine their children to their Idols, then they came the same day into my Sanctuary to prophane it.* But God would not have the Temple to be a receptacle for such. When Christ applieth that Scripture, *Jerem.* 7. against those who bought and sold in the Temple, *Matth.* 21.12,13. he makes it cleare, that the Temple was made a den of robbers, not onely as it was made a place of gaine, or a den where the robbers prey lies, but even as it was a receptacle of the robbers or theeves themselves: therefore he is not contented with the overthrowing of the Tables of money-changers, and the seats of them that sold Doves, but he did also *cast out all them that sold and bought in the Temple:* that is, he would neither suffer such things, nor such persons in the Temple, yea though it was onely in the utmost Court, or the Court of the Gentiles, as *Grotius* and Mr *Selden* thinke: how much lesse would he have

[c] *De monarchia lib.* 2. proinde rectè honestéque vetitum est alicubi, ne merces meretricis inferatur in sacrarium. Atqui nummi per se carent crimine, sed quæ hos accepit unà cum suo quæstu est abominabilis.

have suffered such persons in the Court of *Israel.* [d] *Philo* the Jew doth also apply what is said in the Prophets of Gods hating the Sacrifices of the wicked, even to the excluding of prophane men from the Temple. Mr. *Selden de jure nat. & Gent. lib.* 4. *cap.* 5. doth so explaine that casting out of the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, that the argument in hand is not a little strengthned thereby. He saith truly, that those who were cast out had polluted and profaned that holy place, *ideo & ipsi, ut qui tum criminis aliorum participes, tum suo infames pariter, sic Templum seu montis Templi locum illum ipsis permissum profanabant, ejiciendi.* He holdeth also that this which Christ did was done *ex jure patrio*, to wit, *ex Zelotarum jure:* and that else it had been challenged by the Priests and Scribes, if it had been contrary to the law or custome. Zelots, that is, private persons zealously affected, were permitted to scourge, wound, yea kill such as they saw publiquely committing atrocious wickednesse, by which the holinesse either of the name of God, or of the Temple, or of the Nation of the Jewes was violated. So Mr. *Selden* sheweth out of the Talmudists, *Ib. cap.* 4. Now (saith he) *Zelotarum jure*, our Saviour though a private person (for so he was lookt upon by the Priests and Scribes) did scourge and cast out the buyers and sellers. If so, then certainly such wicked and abominable persons were not allowed to come to the Temple; and if they did, they ought to have been judicially and by authority cast out; for that which was permitted to private persons in the executing of justice or inflicting of punishment, out of their zeale to the glory of God, was much more incumbent to such as had authority in their hands for correcting and removing the prophanation of the Temple in an authoritative, judiciall, and orderly way.

[d] *Lib. de Victimas offerentibus.* Nam veri Dei Templum non patet profanis sacrificiis. Tali homini dicerem, o bone, non gaudet Deus centenis bouum victimis &c. mavult pias mentes &c.

4. The Levites had a charge to let none that were uncleane in any thing enter into the Temple, 2 *Chron.* 23. 19. Now this is like that 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *with such a one no not to eate:* an argument from the deniall of that which is lesse, to the deniall of that which is more. So here, it was a necessary consequence: If those that were ceremonially uncleane were to be excluded from the Temple, much more those who were morally or impiously uncleane. For, 1. the legall uncleannesse did signifie

the sinfull uncleanness; and the exclusion of those that were known to be legally uncleane from the Temple, did signifie the excluding of those who are knowne to be grossely and notoriously uncleane in their life and conversation. Which shall be abundantly confirmed afterwards. Therefore *Bertramus de Rep. Ebr. cap.7.* saith rightly that the Levites had a charge to keepe from the Temple the uncleane *aut etiam alio quovis modo indignos*, or those *also who were any otherwaies unworthy*. 2. *Godwyn* in his *Moses and Aaron, lib.* 5.*cap.* 2. makes a comparison betweene the three degrees of the Jewish excommunication, and the three degrees of excluding the uncleane, *Numb.* 5.2. which parallel if we please to make, then as for any of the three sorts of uncleanness, the touch of the dead, issue, or leprosie, a man was excluded from the campe of God or the Sanctuary; so it will follow that even those who were cast out by the *Niddui* or lowest degree of Excommunication, were for a time suspended from communion with the Church in the Ordinances. 3. The Levites were appointed to put a difference not onely betweene the cleane and the uncleane, but betweene the holy and unholy, *Levit.* 10. 10. or betweene the holy and profane, *Ezech.* 22.26. & 44.23. By *cleane and uncleane* I understand persons or things that were ceremonially such; by *holy and prophane*, persons that were morally such.

Hæc porta &c. i.e. Deus hoc Templum sibi dicari voluit, hîc est sanctuarium ejus: debet pu um esse ab omnibus sordibus, quemadmodum etiam lex severè jubet. Antehac impuri & scelerati (quales Saul, & alii omnes impii qui primas tenebant, ita ut nemo non putasset ipsorum esse Templum) corruperant hoc templum. Non fuit igitur tam domicilium ipsius Dei, quam latronum caverna.

5. I prove the same point from *Psalm* 118.19,20. *open to me the gates of righteousnesse, I will goe into them, and will praise the Lord. This gate of the Lord into which the righteous shall enter.* The Chaldee saith, *The gate of the house of the Sanctuary of the Lord.* The gates of Gods Sanctuary, are called *gates of righteousnesse*, saith *Ainsworth* on the place, *because onely the just and cleane might enter into them.* We read also that it was written over the gates of some of the Jewish Synagogues, *This is the gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter.* * *Vatablus* upon this place, thinks that *David* speakes by way of *antithesis* to the former pollution of the Sanctuary by *Saul*, and other wicked persons, who by comming to the house of God had made it a denne of thieves. But now the righteous shall enter in it. [The righteous] *for to such* (saith *Diodati*) *and not to pro-*

prophane persons, it belongeth to enter in there.

6. The same thing may be proved, from *Psalm* 15. 1. *Lord who shall abide in thy Tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousnesse, &c.* I know the chiefe intendment of God in this place is to describe such a one as is a true member of the Church invisible, and shall enter into the Heavenly *Jerusalem.* But certainly there is an allusion to the Sanctuary, and the holy hill thereof in *Jerusalem*, as to the type of that which is Spiriuall and eternall, which *Jansenius* upon the place noteth: and the Prophet here teacheth the people so to looke upon those offences for which men were excluded from the Sanctuary, as to learne what kind of persons are true members of the Church, and who not; who shall be allowed to communicate in all the Ordinances of the new Testament, and who not; who shall be received into everlasting life, and who not; and thus by the type he holds forth the thing tipyfied; *Gesnerus* upon the place thinkes that communion with the Church in this world is meant in the first words, *Lord who shall sojourne* (so the word is *jagur* in the Hebrew, παροικήσει in the Greek) *in thy Tabernacle.* (the name of Tabernacle fitly expressing the moveable and military estate of the Church in this world:) and that reception into the Church Triumphant, is meant in the following words: *who shall dwell in thy holy hill?* which noteth a permanent and durable estate. The Chaldee Paraphrase expoundeth the whole, of such as were thought worthy to be admitted into the house of the Lord, thus, *Lord who is worthy to abide in thy Tabernacle? and who shall be worthy to sojourne in the mountaine of the house of thy holinesse.* So *Psalm* 24. 3. the Chaldee readeth thus, *Who shall be worthy to ascend unto the mountaine of the house of the Sanctuary of the Lord?* So that the thing alluded unto in both these places, is that the Priests and Levites did admit none to the Sanctuary, but such as had the markes or characters there enumerated, so farre as men can judge of these markes, that is so farre as they are externall and discernable.

7. The same thing seemeth also to be alluded unto *Psalm* 50. 16. *Unto the wicked* (the Chaldee addes, *that repenteth not, and prayeth in his transgression*) *God saith, what hast thou to doe to de-*

clare my Statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth. It is spoken to a scandalous prophane man, Vers. 18, 19, 20. who yet will needs take upon him a forme of godlinesse.

e *Lib. 3. de vita Mosis: quem ne honoris quidem gratia fas est nominari ab omnibus sed à solis optimis & purificatis hominibus.*

e Where *Philo* the Jew speakes of him that blasphemed the name of the Lord, he addeth, that it was not lawfull for all men to name the name of God, no not for Honour or Religions sake, but onely for good and holy men. And this gives me occasion to adde in conclusion a further confirmation out of the Hebrew Doctors. They held that an Israelite turning an Hereticke, (that is, denying any of their thirteen fundamentall Articles) to be as an Heathen man, and did therefore permit a Jew to lend to him upon usury even as to an Heathen. M. *Selden de Jure nat. & Gentium. lib. 6. cap. 10.* They held that such a one, an hereticall Israelite, had no communion with the Church of *Israel.* See *Tzemach David* translated by *Hen. Vorstius* pag. 67. *Abrabanel de capite fidei cap. 3. dub. 5. & Ib. cap. 6.* They esteemed an hereticall Jew, more hereticall then a Christian, and did excommunicate him, even summarily and without previous admonition. See *Buxtorf. lexic. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin.* pag. 195. *Moses Maimonides de fundam. legis. cap. 6. sect. 10.* tels us that if an Epicurean Israelite had written a coppy of the booke of the Law, it was to be burnt, with the name of that Epicurean wretch, becaus he had not done it holily, nor in the name of God. They who did imagine the Scripture it selfe to be polluted and prophaned, when it came thorough the hands of an Epicurean, or Hereticall Israelite, no doubt, they thought the Temple polluted and prophaned, if such a one should be suffered to come and worship in it. From all which it appeareth, how much reason *L' Empereur* had to say, that they did not admit an Heretick into the inner part of the *Intermurale*, or that part of the Temple which divided between the Israelites and Heathens.

If any man shall aske, what I meane to inferre from all this. Must all prophane persons be kept back from our Churches and publike Assemblies, and so from hearing the word? I answer; God forbid. The Analogy which I understand is to hold between the Jewish and Christian Church, is this. As prophane persons were forbidden to enter into the Temple becaus of the

sacramentall

sacramentall and typicall holinesse thereof (for the Temple was a Type of Christ) so prophane persons are now much more to be kept back from the Sacrament of the Lord Supper, which hath more of Sacramentall signification, mystery, and holinesse in it, then the Temple of *Jerusalem* had, and whereby more ample Evangelicall promises are set forth and sealed unto us. And as prophane persons might of old come into the Court of the Gentiles, and there heare the word preached in *Solomons* Porch (where both Christ and his Apostles did Preach *Io.* 10. 23. *Act* 3. 11. *Act.* 5. 12. which Porch was in the utmost Court, That is, the Court of the Gentiles: of which else-where out of *Josephus*) but might not come into the Court of *Israel*, nor have communion in the Sacrifices: so prophane obstinate sinners are to be excluded, for their impiety, from the Church communion of Saints, though they may heare the word, as Heathens also may doe. Now that the Temple of *Ierusalem* had a Typicall Sacramentall resemblance of Christ, may appear plainly in divers particulars. 1. As the glory of the Lord dwelt in the Temple within the oracle, above the Arke and the Mercy seat; and at the dedication of the Temple, the cloud of the glory of the Lord did visibly fill the whole house; so in Christ the fulnesse of the God-head dwells bodily, as the Apostle speakes. 2. As the great God whom the heavens of heavens cannot containe, was yet pleased to dwell on earth, by putting his name in that place; so notwithstanding of the infinite distance between God and man, yet they are brought neer each to other, to have fellow-ship together in Jesus Christ. 3. God revealed his will, that he would accept no Sacrifices from his people, but in the Temple onely, after it was built: So God hath revealed his will, that our spirituall Sacrifices cannot be acceptable to him, except in Jesus Christ onely. 4. The people of God were bound to set their Faces toward the Temple of *Hierusalem*, when they prayed 1 *Kings* 8 30. 48. *Dan.* 6. 10. So are we bound in Prayer to looke toward Jesus Christ with an eye of faith 5. As there was an ample promise of God to heare the Prayers which should be made in that place 2. *Chro.* 7. 15, 16. so hath God promised to heare us and accept us, if we seeke unto him in and through Jesus Christ. 6. God said of the

Temple, *mine eyes and mine heart, shall be there perpetually.* 2 *Chro.* 6. 16. so he said of Christ, *This is my well beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* 7. There was but one Temple so but *one Mediator between God and man, the man Iesus Christ* saith *Paul.* 8. As the Temple was appointed to be a house of Prayer for all Nations *Isa.* 56. 7. and the stranger, as well as the Israelite, might come and pray in it 2 *Chro.* 6. 32. So Christ is a propitiation, not for the Jewes onely, but for the Gentiles; and whosoever beleeves on him, (Jew or Gentile) shall not be confounded. 9. *Because of thy Temple at Hierusalem, shall Kings bring presents unto thee,* saith the Prophet, *Ps.* 68. 29. so because of Jesus Christ (who hath got a name above every name, and hath received all power in heaven and earth) shall Kings submit themselves and bow the knee. 10. Glorious things were spoken of *Ierusalem* the City of God, but the Temple was the glory of *Ierusalem:* so glorious things are spoken of the Church, But Christ is the Churches glory. Other like considerations might be added, but these may suffice.

CHAP. X.

A debate with Master Prynne, *concerning the exclusion of prophane scandalous persons from the passeover.*

THat which Master *Prynne* in his Vindication *pag.* 15, 16. pleadeth for his opinion, from the Law of the passeover, may be (as I conceive) with no great difficulty answered, and I shall doe it very shortly, (being to insist further in answering *Erastus,* who said much more for that point, which deserveth an answer) First, in answer to our argument from the keeping back of the unclean. *Num.* 9. he saith, *that all circumcised persons whatsoever, had a right to eat the passeover, &c. being bound to eat the passeover in its season, except in cases of necessity, disability, by reason of a journey, or of legall uncleanesse onely, not spirituall, as is cleer by Exo.* 12. 3. 43. *to* 50. Num. 9. 1. *to* 15. Deut. 16. 16, 17. Ezra. 6. 19, 20, 21. 2 Kings 23. 21, 22, 2. *Chron.* 35. 6, 7. 13. 17. 18. *where we read that all the people and all the males that*

that were present received the passeover, not one of them being excluded from eating it.

Answ. 1. If it was so, doth not this make as much against himselfe as against us, unlesse he will say, that the Analogy must hold so farre, that all Baptized persons whatsoever, none excepted (if it be not in cases of necessity or disability) how scandalous, impenitent, and obstinate soever they be, ought to be admitted to the Lords Table? so there shall be no excommunication at all (which yet himselfe granteth) for if any Baptized person, (though such as Master *Prynne* himselfe would have to be excommunicated) shall be shut out from the Church and from all publike Ordinances, and so from the Lords Supper, because of his obstinacy and continuance in some foule scandall, after previous admonitions, in so doing, we shall, by his principles, doe contrary to the Law of the passeover, in the point of Analogy. 2. The Texts cited by him, prove that men were debarred for legall uncleanesse, but there is not one of them which will prove that men were debarred onely for legall uncleanesse, and no man for morall uncleanesse. Yea, one of those Texts. *Ezra.* 6. 21. tells us that those who were admitted to the passeover, were such *as had separated themselves from the filthynesse of the heathen of the Land, to seeke the Lord God of* Israel. 3. That morall uncleanesse, I meane known prophanesse or scandalous sinnes, did render men uncapable of eating the passeover, I shall prove anone by divers arguments, unto which I remit Master *Prynne*.

That which hee objecteth from 1 *Cor.* 10. I am to answer also distinctly by it selfe. His second reply is, *that those who were legally uncleane at the day appointed for the passeover, so as they could not then receive it, were yet peremptorily enjoyned to eat it the* 14. *day of the second moneth, &c.* Num. 9. 11. 12. *he must not be suspended from it above one moneth.* *Answ.* The Scripture cited proves no such thing, except upon supposition that they be clean the 14. day of the following moneth. And what if any of them were in the second moneth also uncleane, by the touch of a dead body or otherwise? Were they not kept off in the second moneth, as well as in the first? Is it not plainly said of the second passeover *vers.* 12. (the very place cited by himselfe) *according*

according to all the Ordinances of the passeover they shall keep it? and one of those Ordinances was the keeping back the uncleane.

Thirdly, he saith, that he who was legally uncleane, was kept back neither by the Priest nor Magistrate, but by those of the same Family as *vers. 6, 7.* imports. *And the true reason* (saith he) *in this Text why his uncleanesse did seclude him from eating the passeover, was because it quite excluded him out of the camp for a time, (not Tabernacle or Temple) and so by necessary consequence from the house wherein he was to eat the passeover, &c.* and by like reason it debarred him from all other Ordinances.

Answ. 1 The Text *Num. 9. 6, 7.* tells us the unclean were kept back; but by whom they were kept back, it tells not. That it was neither left free to the unclean person to eat of the passeover, nor to the Family to admit him, but that there was an authoritative restraint, I prove by this argument. He that was uncleane and before his cleasing did eat of the flesh of the Peace-offerings was cut off from among his people *Lev. 7. 20. 21*, Therefore he that in his uncleanesse, did eat the passeover, was to be cut off also. No man will say that there was any lesse punishment intended for the pollution of the passeover, than for the pollution of Peace-offerings. And if the uncleane were not permitted, under the Law, to eat of the Flesh of the Sacrifices, or if they did they were cut off; shall not as great care be had to keep the body of Jesus Christ (which was signified by the flesh of the sacrifices) and the bloud of the Covenant, from being trod under Foot by Dogges and Swine?

2. Neither is there any such reason in that Text *Num. 9.* as the excluding quite out of the camp, those who were uncleane by a dead body, and so by consequence from the passeover. Nay the Text rather intimateth, that they were in the camp; for they came before *Moses* and *Aaron* on that day, when the passeover was kept, and said, *We are defiled by the dead body of a man, Wherefore are we kept back*, vers. *6. 7.* I hope *Moses* and *Aaron* were not without the camp. I knew the Lepers and some other uncleane persons were put out of the camp; but there is not one of the Texts cited by him which gives the least shadow of reason to prove that the uncleane by the dead body of a man were quite excluded out of the Camp, except *Num. 5. 2.* And if he will

will beleive the Hebrew Doctors, and others upon that place, there were three Camps, the Camp of Israel, the Camp of the Levites, and the Camp of Divine Majesty; (f) The uncleane by the dead were free (say they) to be in the first two Camps, and were onely excluded from the third. However, its agreed, that some uncleane persons were excluded from the Sanctuary, who were not excluded from the camp of the Chidren of *Israel*, as is observed by *Tostatus* in *Lev.* 12. *Quæst.* 21. *Menochius in Num.* 5. 2. the English Annotations on *Num.* 5. 2. and others. And if Master *Prynne* can prove, that those uncleane persons who were excluded from the Sanctuary, were not excluded from the Passeover, let him try it. That this thing may be yet better understood, let us observe with *Tostatus in Levit.* 22. *Quest.* 7. a threefold separation of the uncleane under the Law: some were separate onely from the Sanctuary and the holy things; for he that had but touched a man or a woman, who had an issue, or had touched the Bed, Clothes, or any thing else, which had been under him or her, was not permitted to come unto the Tabernacle, till he was cleansed *Lev.* 15. Others were separated both from the holy things, and from the company or society of their Neighbours, yet not cast out of the camp: for this he gives the case of women having an issue of blood, who were put apart seven dayes *Lev.* 15. and for the same space a woman after the birth of a male Child, was uncleane, so farre as to be kept apart from human society, but she did continue uncleane three and thirty dayes longer, as to the Sanctuary and hallowed things, during which space of the three and thirty dayes, she was not separated from company and society, as in the first seven dayes, onely she was forbidden to touch any hallowed thing, or to come into the Sanctuary. There was a third sort separated not onely from the Sanctuary, and from humane society, but also cast out of the camp, which was the case of Lepers. I conclude, all uncleane persons whatsoever were excluded from the Tabernacle *Lev.* 15. 31. and from eating of the flesh of the Sacrifices *Lev.* 7. 20. 21. Neither might any of the Sonnes of *Aaron* having his uncleanesse upon him eat of the holy things, though it was his Food *Lev.* 22. *v.* 2. to 7. In which places cutting off is appointed to be the punish-

(f) *Vatablus in Num.* 5. 2. Tria secundum Hebræos castra erant. Castra nempe Dei, id est Tabernaculum: Castra levitarum, & castra Israel. Leprosi ab omnibus arcebantur: Impuri per fluxum à primis duobus excludebantur. Pollutus vero propter cadaver solum à tabernaculo Ecclesiæ arcebatur. *Godwyn* in his *Moses and Aarom lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. citeth *Paulus fagius* for the same thing. See also Mr. *Weemse* his *Christian Synagogue* pag. 135. 136.

ment, not for unclean persons their being in the camp, but for their coming to the Tabernacle, or for their eating of the holy things; and accordingly it is said 2 *Chro.* 23. 19. that *Iehojada set the Porters at the Gates of the house of the Lord, that none which was uncleane in any thing should enter in.* But we never read that none which was uncleane in any thing, was permitted to enter in at the Gates of *Ierusalem*, or to converse among the people.

3 Whereas Master *Prynne* thinkes that uncleane persons were excluded from all Ordinances, as well as from the Passeover, first, what saith he to that which *Erastus* holdeth and (as he thinkes) grounded upon Scripture, namely that all uncleane persons as well as others, were admitted to the feast of expiation? Next, what saith he to that which is observed by Master *Selden* and divers others, namely, that some uncleane persons might come not onely to the mountaine of the house of the Lord, but might also enter into the *intermurale?* Into that utmost Court the heathens might come and pray: & so might the Israelites that were not legally cleane saith (g) *Arias Montanus.*

(g) *De templi fabric.* p. 15. in quod (atrium) exteri, id est Gentes, quæ Israelis nomen non profiterentur, convenire ad orandum possent: & Israelitæ etiam qui cæremoniali ritu puri non essent:

The fourth and fifth Answers which Mr. *Prynne* gives that there is no such warrant for keeping back scandalous persons from the Lords Table, as there was for keeping back the uncleane from the Passeover; and that suspension for legall uncleanesse: proves not suspension for morall uncleanesse, These I say doe but *petere principium*, and therefore to be passedover, becaus he takes for granted what is in controversie.

I shall therefore proceed to that which he addeth in the next place, in answer to an argument of mine in my controversall fast Sermon, (as he miscalleth it) The argument as I did propound it, was this. Those scandalous sinners that were not admitted to offer a trespasse offering (which was reconciling ordinance) without confession of sinne, and Declaration of their Repentance for the same, were much lesse admitted to the Passeover (which was a sealing Ordinance) without confession of known and scandalous sins, if they had committed any such. But circumcised persons, if they were scandalous sinners, were not admitted to offer a trespasse offering (which was a reconciling Ordinance) without confession of sinne and Declaration of their Repentance for the same *Lev.* 5. 5. 6. *Ergo*

Master

Mr *Prynne* answereth pag. 17. its a meer *non-sequitur*. 1. Because contradicted (as he thinks) by 1 *Cor.* 10. which is a contrarious argument, and I shall answer it in the proper place. 2. He saith that examination of the Conscience, Repentance, and Confession, are no where required of such as did eate the Passeover, it being onely a commemoration of Gods mercy in passing over the Israelites first borne, when he slew the Egyptians: but there being no remission without confession, it was necessary that those who came to offer a trespasse-offering for some particular sinnes, should confesse those very sinnes, yet not to the Priest, but to God alone.

Answ. 1. If examination of the Conscience, Repentance, and confession, were not required in those that did eate the Passeover, and if there might be a worthy eating of it without this (as he plainly intimateth when he saith that *this is no where required in Scripture, of such as did eat the Passeover, though all circumstances and necessaries for the worthy eating of it, he most punctually enumerated*) And if the Passeover was *but onely a commemoration of Gods infinite mercy in passing over the Israelites first borne*, as he saith, (which was but a temporall mercy) Then he must needs say, either that in the Sacrament of the Passeover, no confirmation of faith, increase of grace, nor spirituall mercy was given, or that in that Sacrament this grace (yea, by his Principles, conversion and regeneration it selfe) was conferred *ex opere operato*. And he must either say the like of the Lords Supper, or otherwise hold that the Sacraments of the new Testament differ from those of the old, specifically; and that the Passeover did not seale the same covenant of grace for the substance, which is now sealed by the Lords Supper.

2 What was the meaning of the bitter Herbs, with which the Passeover was commanded to be eaten? Were not the people of God thereby taught the necessity of Repentance in that very action? And what means it that at *Hezekiahs* Passeover, the people are called to turne againe unto the Lord, 2 *Chron.* 30. 6. that the Priests and the Levites were ashamed and sanctified themselves, *vers.* 15. & offered Peace-offerings *made confession to the Lord God of their fathers*, vers. 22. where I understand confession of sinne, according to the Law, which appointed confession

of sinne to be made with the Peace offerings, which confession was signified by laying hands upon the head of the offering *Lev.* 3. 2. 8. 13. compared with *Lev.* 16. 21. and so we find Repentance joyned with peace offerings. *Iudg.* 20. 26. finally read we not of the peoples preparing of their heart to seeke God at the Passeover 2 *Chro.* 30. 19. which as it could not be without Repentance and examination of their consciences, so *Hezekiah* mentioneth it, as that without which the peoples eating of the Passeover, could not have been in any wise accepted.

3. That it was not a private confession to God alone, but a publike penitentiall confession in the Temple, and before the Priests, I have before *Chap.* 8. made it to appear both out of the Text, and out of *Philo* the *Iew.* This I adde here. The Confession of the sin was made in the place of offering the trespasse offering, before the Priest, at the laying on of hands between the horns of the beast, therefore it was not made in secret to God onely: which doth further appear, by the lawes concerning such and such Sacrifices, for such and such sinnes, *Lev.* 5. and by the restitution which was also joyned with the confession *Num.* 5. 7. And it is also cleare from the Jewish (h) *Canones pœnitentiæ cap.* 1. & 2. where we find confession of sinne to be made both by word of mouth, and publikely before the congregation.

(h) *Vide edit. latin. Cantabr. anno.* 1631. pag. 5. Eximia laus est pœnitentiam agenti, ut publicè confiteatur, iniquitates suas toti cœtui indicans, & delicta quæ in proximum admisit, aliis aperiens hunc in modum, Revera peccavi in N. N. (virum nominans) & hæc & illa feci: Ecce autem me vobis nunc convertor & me facti pœniret. Qui verò præ superbia non indicat, sed abscondit iniquitates suas, illi perfecta non est pœnitentia, Quia dicitur, *Qui abscondit scelera sua, non dirigetur.*

4. In stead of making my argument a *non-sequitur*, he makes it a *clarè-sequitur*: for the first part of it not being taken off, but rather granted by him, because (as he saith truly) without confession of sin there is no remission of it, hence the other part must needs follow: for if it was in vaine so much as to sue for pardon in a reconciling Ordinance, when the sinne was not confessed; how much more had it been a taking in vaine of the name of God, & a prophaning of a sealing Ordinance, to seale up pardon to a scandalous sinner, who had not so much as confessed his scandalous sin, but continued in manifest impetency?

But,

But we will trie whether his third and laſt anſwer can relieve him. It is this: *That every particular communicant before he comes to receive the Sacrament, makes a publike confeſsion of his ſinnes to God with the reſt of the congregation, and in words at leaſt, voweth newneſſe of life for the future, there being no communicant that ever I heard of* (ſaith he) *ſo deſperatly wicked and atheiſtically, as not to profeſſe heartily ſorrow for all his forepaſt ſinnes, or to avow impenitent continuance in them when he came to the Lords Table.* Behold, what a latitude? If the vileſt ſinner practically perſevering in a ſcandalous ſinne, ſhall but joyne with, and not gainſay the publique confeſſion of the whole congregation (wherein the beſt men doe and ought to joyne) and in words promiſe newneſſe of life (and who will not promiſe to endeavour to live better?) nay if he have but ſo much wit, as not to profeſſe or avow impenitency: then Mr. *Prynne* alloweth his admiſſion to the Sacrament. But is this the confeſſion that my argument did prove? nothing like it. It was a particular confeſſion of ſuch a ſinne by name, *Levit.* 5.5. *and it ſhall be when he ſhall be guilty in one of theſe things, that he ſhall confeſſe that he hath ſinned in that thing:* and with the confeſſion there was a reall amendment. For inſtance, a recompencing of the treſpaſſe with the principall, and the addition of a fifth part, when the caſe did ſo require, *Num.* 5.7. *Then they ſhall confeſſe their ſinne which they have done, and he ſhall recompence his treſpaſſe*, &c. This is that my argument did drive at, and it ſtill ſtands in force to conclude that the confeſſion of the particular ſinne which hath given publique ſcandall, [i] together with the forſaking of it externally and in practice, is ſo neceſſary, that without theſe the admiſſion of a ſcandalous ſinner is a moſt horrible prophanation of the Sacrament.

But now finding the argument concerning the Paſſeover and legall uncleanneſſe to have been more fully proſecuted by *Eraſtus* than it is by Mr. *Prynne*, I doe reſolve to trace it hard at the heeles whitherſoever it goeth.

[i] *R. Moſis canones pœnitentiæ cap.* 2. Quicunque verbis confitetur, & ex corde non ſtatuit peccatum derelinquere: ecce hic ei ſimilis eſt qui lavat, & manu reptile immundum retinet: Neque enim quicquam prodeſt lavatio, donec reptile abjecerit. Et hoc illud eſt quod a Sapiente illo dicitur. *Qui autem confeſſus fuerit & reliquerit ea, miſericordiam conſequetur.* Quin & oportet ut peccatum ſpeciatim recenſeat: Quia dicitur: *Obſecro domine, peccavit populus iſte peccatum maximum fecerunque ſibi deos aureos.*

CHAP.

Chap. XI.

A Confutation of the strongest arguments of Erastus, *namely, those drawn from the Law of* Moses.

k *Confirm. Thes. lib 1. cap. 3. & 4.*

AMong *Erastus* k his arguments against Excommunication, three of them, namely, the first, the seventh, and the sixteenth, are all one for the substance, the strength of them lying in this supposition, that the Scripture doth not restraine, nor keep off any from the Sacrifices nor any other Sacraments (as he speaketh) of the old Testament, because of a wicked or scandalous conversation: but contrariwise commandeth that all the males both Jewes and forreiners, being circumcised, and not being legally uncleane, nor in a journey, should compear thrice in the yeere before the Lord at *Ierusalem*, to keepe the three solemn feasts, of the Passeóver, Weeks, and Tabernacles. Now (saith he) Christ hath not in this thing destroyed nor altered the Law of *Moses*, nor hath he made the rule straiter now then it was then: but as then all circumcised, so now all baptized persons must be acknowledged for Church members, having a right to partake of Church priviledges: and as then there was no discipline or punishment for the flagitious and wicked, except by the hand of the Magistrate; so ought it to be in like manner in the Christian Church. This argument he trusteth very much unto. And because it is the common opinion, that the excluding and separating of the uncleane under the Law, did signifie the excluding of scandalous sinners from communion with the Church, he spendeth l a long chapter against that opinion, and laboureth to make it appeare that the legall uncleanesse did signifie the corruption of our nature and unbeliefe; that exclusion from the Temple did signifie exclusion from the heavenly Paradice; and that the cleansing and reception into the Temple, did tipyfie the cleansing of our souls, and the turning of us to God by the blood of Jesus Christ.

l *Lib. 2. cap. 1.*

Now here I shall make such animadversions, as shall not onely

onely enervate the ſtrength which theſe arguments may ſeem to have againſt Church cenſures: but alſo afford ſome ſtrong reaſonings againſt *Eraſtus*, from thoſe very grounds rightly apprehended, from which (upon miſapprehenſions) he diſputeth againſt the excluding of ſcandalous ſinners. *Firſt*, it is certaine that for divers ſinnes againſt the morall Law, the ſinners were appointed not onely to bring their Treſpaſſe-offerings, but to confeſſe the ſinne which they had committed, // and to declare their repentance for the ſame, and till this was done, the Treſpaſſe-offering was not accepted. Let us but have the like, that is a confeſſion of the ſinne, and declaration of repentance, and then men ſhall not be excluded for ſcandals formerly given. [m] *Eraſtus* himſelfe acknowledgeth that in this point of the confeſſion of ſinne, the analogy muſt hold betwixt the old and new Teſtament; onely he pleadeth, that the very act, the very deſiring of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, is really a confeſſion that he is a ſinner who deſireth it: and that, much more, it may ſuffice, if ſinners being asked by the Miniſter, confeſſe themſelves to be ſinners, and that they have not perfectly kept the Commandements of God. But all this, ſay I, can not ſatisfie the argument drawn from that confeſſion of ſinne under the Law. For, 1. It was not a confeſſion *ipſo facto*, by the bringing of the Treſpaſſe-offerings, but by word of mouth, and [n] thus it hath been expounded by the Hebrew Doctors. *The owners of ſiune and Treſpaſſe-offerings, when they bring their oblations for their ignorant or for their preſumptuous ſinnes, atonement is not made for them by their oblation, untill they have made repentance, and confeſſion by word of mouth.* // 2. It was not a generall confeſſion that one is a ſinner, and hath not perfectly kept the Commandements of God, (for who did ever refuſe to make ſuch a confeſſion, that were in their right wits? that limitation is as good as nothing, when we ſpeake of the ſuſpending of any from the Lords Table.) But it was a confeſſion of the particular individuall ſinne, which had been committed, *Levit.* 5. 5. *And it ſhall be when he ſhall be guilty in one of theſe things, that he ſhall confeſſe that he hath ſinned in that thing.* Marke, *in that thing.* *Num.* 5. 7. *Then they ſhall confeſſe their ſinne which they have done.* [o] Which

[m] *Pag.* 106, 107, 148, 149.

[n] See *Ainſworth* annot. on Num. 5. 7.

[o] *Ainſworth* on Levit. 6. 4.

Law

Law is to be understood of all like sinnes and trespasses, that is, that other sinnes which were expiated by Sacrifice, were first to be confessed. All this maketh against *Erastus*.

p *Pag.* 106. 113. Next, whereas he saith p that this confession or declaration of repentance for sinne, in the old Testament, had place onely in those sinnes for which the Law appointed no particular punishments: and that there was no confession imposed where the Magistrate was to punish the crime: This with a great deale of boldnesse and confidence (as his manner is) he doth maintaine: Intending thereby (it seems) to exempt from all manner of Church-discipline whatsoever is punishable by the civill Magistrate, as adultery, perjury, and the like. But that which he affirmeth so strongly, is manifestly contrary to the expresse Law, *Levit.* 6. from vers. 1. to vers. 8. where wilfull lying, and perjury, robbing and violence, fraud and couzenage, all these were to be confessed and expiated by Sacrifice; notwithstanding that they were also to be severely punished by the civill Magistrate. Nay, in that very place it is commanded that what had been violently taken away, or deceitfully gotten, or fraudulently detained, should be restored, and moreover a fifth part added thereto, for a mulct, yet this did not exempt the sinner from making confession. So *Num.* 5. 6, 7, 8. for one and the same offence the Law enjoyneth both that confession be made and expiation; and moreover that recompence be made to the party injured or to his kinsman. Yea the Law, *Num.* 5. 6, 7. speaketh universally; *When a man or woman shall commit any sinne that men commit*, &c. *then they shall confesse their sinne which they have done*. Which made the Hebrews extend this Law to criminall and capitall cases, as Mr. *Ainsworth* upon the place noteth out of these words of *Maimony*. *Likewise, all condemned to death by the Magistrates, or condemned to stripes; no atonement is made for them by their death, or by their stripes, untill they have repented and confessed. And so he that hurteth his neighbour, or doth him dammage, though he payeth him what ever he oweth him, atonement is not made for him till he confesse.* Therfore *Erastus* is still a double loser in arguing from the Law of *Moses*. It proves not what he would, and it doth prove what he would not.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, men were kept from the Sanctuary of the Lord, not onely for ceremoniall, but for morall uncleanneſſe, I meane for publique and ſcandalous ſinnes againſt the morall Law. *Ezech.* 44. 7, 9. God was offended when ſuch proſelytes were brought into his Sanctuary, as were either uncircumciſed in fleſh, or uncircumciſed in heart; that is, whoſe practiſe or converſation did declare them to be uncircumciſed in heart: elſe the Lord would not have challenged thoſe who brought ſuch proſelytes into his Sanctuary, if their uncircumciſion of heart had not been externally manifeſted, ſo that it might be perceived by his people; according to that *Pſalm* 36. 1. *The tranſgreſſion of the wicked ſaith within my heart, that there is no feare of God before his eyes.* To the ſame purpoſe we read *Ezra* 6. 21. not that all proſelytes, nor all uncircumciſed, but onely *all ſuch as had ſeperate themſelves from the filthineſſe of the Heathen of the Land, to ſeeke the Lord God of Iſrael*, did eate of the Paſſeover. Moreover we may argue by a neceſſary conſequence from Scripture. The ceremoniall uncleanneſſe was a cauſe of excluſion from the Sanctuary, and from the holy things. Therefore much more morall uncleanneſſe. It was more ſinfull in its ſelfe, and more abominable in Gods ſight for thoſe who did ſteale, murder, commit adultery, ſweare falſely, and burne Incenſe to *Baal*, to come and tread in the Courts of the houſe of the Lord, and to offer Sacrifices there, as if Gods houſe had been a denne of robbers, *Iſa.* 1. 11, 12, 13, 14. *Jerem.* 7. 9, 10, 11. This I ſay was more abominable to God then if he that had touched a dead body, or had come into the tent where a man died, ſhould have come unto the Tabernacle in his legall uncleanneſſe. Therefore when Chriſt caſteth out the buyers and ſellers out of the Temple, it is not for ceremoniall but morall uncleanneſſe, and he applieth to them the words of *Jeremiah*, *Ye have made it a denne of theeves*, *Matth.* 21. 13. with *Jerem.* 7. 11. And as it was more ſinfull to the perſon, and more hatefull to God, ſo it was more hurtfull to the ſoules of others, who were in greater danger of infection from the morall, then from the ceremoniall uncleanneſſe. This [q] *Eraſtus* denieth indeed, but his expreſsion is unſavoury and unholy, which I am aſhamed to repeat. Sure the Apoſtle ſpeaketh farre othewiſe *Heb.* 12. 15, 16.

[q] Pag. 145. Cum ergo quæritur cur ei qui ſemen præter voluntatem noctu emiſit, ad ſacra adire non licuerit, priuſquàm mundaretur, ſcortatori autem & concubinario licuerit? reſpondeo, quia ille ad ſe appropinquantes contaminabat; hic Deo & ſibi immundus tantum erat: alioſque non magis inquinabat, quàm ſi cum uxore legitima cubaviſſet.

15, 16. *Lest any root of bitternesse springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or prophane person, as Esau.* A prophane or scandalous person defileth, you see, many others: and sinne was of a defiling nature under the old Testament, as well as under the new. I meane a root of bitternesse not plucked up, a prophane person not censured, doth defile others, as well as himselfe. Both *Peter* and *Jude* have told us, that scandalous persons are spots and blemishes in the communion of Saints, 2 *Pet.* 2. 13. *Jude* vers. 12. So that as *Erastus* granteth, that one legally uncleane could make others legally uncleane among whom he came, and therefore was kept off from fellowship and company with the congregation of Gods people: It must likewise be granted, that scandalous persons are to be suspended from the sacred communion of the Christian Church, because if they should be admitted, the Church should be thereby sinfully defiled. For if the saying *God speed* to a false teacher make us partakers of his evill deeds 2 *John* 10. how much more doth the admitting of such or the like scandalous sinners to the Lords Table make (I say not all who communicate then and there, but) all who consent to their admission, to be partakers of their evill deeds.

r Pag. 140. Quocirca non fuit exclusio hæc, qua propter legis immunditiam aliqui prohibebantur venire in cœtus publicos, figura rei cujuspiam in hoc seculo complendæ, sed imago & simulacrum fuit rei in altera vita perficiendæ.

Fourthly, whereas r *Erastus* holdeth that the exclusion of the uncleane under the Law, did onely typyfie something which is to come to passe in the life to come, that is, the shutting forth of sinners from the Heavenly Paradice, if they be not washed from their filthynesse by the blood of Jesus Christ: and therefore ought not to be unto us any argument for the exclusion of scandalous sinners. I answer, If the shutting out from Heaven was the onely thing signified, and if there be a fit analogy or proportion between the Type and the thing typified, then 1. one may be in Heaven and cast out againe, and in and out againe, as under the Law one might be many times admitted to the Temple and shut out againe. 2. It would also follow, that there is some other exclusion greater then the exclusion from Heaven, as under the Law there was a greater exclusion than the exclusion from the Sanctuary, and that was to be cast out from the company and conversation

verſation of Gods people : [f] for though every uncleanneſſe which did exclude one from the company of the Iſraelites, did alſo exclude him from the Sanctuary; yet every uncleanneſſe which did exclude one from the Sanctuary, did not exclude him from the company of the Iſraelites. Even as now among us, ſuſpenſion from the Lords Table is not the greateſt and worſt excluſion, but there is another greater then that. Thus you ſee *Eraſtus* could not make his Type agree with his Anti-type. Whence it doth further appeare that the excluſion of the uncleane under the Law, did teach and hold forth ſomewhat in a politicall ſence, touching the communion and fellowſhip of the Church in this life. Whatſoever it might ſignifie more, I will not now diſpute, but this it did ſignifie. And this I ſhall ſo farre make good, that I ſhall at once both anſwer *Eraſtus*, and propound a ſtrong argument for the keeping off from the holy things thoſe that are morally aud ſcandalouſly encleane. *Firſt*, let it be remembered that I have proved already from *Heb.*12.15,16. 2 *Pet.*2.13. *Jude* verſ.12. that the people of God are defiled by communion and fellowſhip with ſcandalous ſinners. In the *ſecond* place conſider that prophecy, *Iſa.*52.1. *Put on thy beautifull garments, O Jeruſalem, the holy City: for henceforth there ſhall no more come into thee the uncircumciſed aud the uncleane.* That whole Chapter is a prophecy concerning the condition of the Church in the New Teſtament, as is evident by ſix parallels at leaſt. Verſ.5. with *Rom.*2.24. Verſ.7. with *Rom.*10.15. Verſ.10. with *Luke* 3.6. the beginning of Verſ.11. with *Revel.*18.4. the following part of Verſ.11. with 2 *Cor.*6.17. Verſ.15. with *Rom.*15.21. Neither is it the Church inviſible, but the Church viſible, for Verſ.15. is applied to the calling of the Gentiles *Rom.*15.21. and Verſ.11. to the Churches open ſeparation from *Babylon*, *Revel.*18.4. It is alſo the Church miniſteriall Verſ.7,8,11. *How beautifull upon the mountaines are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, &c. Thy watchmen ſhall lift up the voyce, &c. Be ye cleane that beare the veſſels of the Lord.* It remaines to conſider what is meant by the *uncleane*, Verſ.1. it cannot be meant of legall uncleanneſſe. (the ceremoniall Law being aboliſhed) nor of the hid uncleanneſſe of cloſe hypocrites (for in that ſence it is

[f] *Toſtatus in Levit.*12.*quæſt.*21.

onely the priviledge of the Church triumphant, that no uncleane thing, nor no hypocrite shall enter there.) It must therefore be meant of such as are visibly or scandalously uncleane. And when it is said, *there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised, and the uncleane*, it must be understood *respective*, the uncircumcised, signifying such as are not fit to be at all Church-members: the uncleane signifying such as are not fit to have communion in the holy things: for so these two were distinguished under the Law. *Thirdly*, there is another place which (to me) puts it out of controversie, 2 *Cor.* 6: 14, 15, 16, 17. Where the Apostle exhorteth believers to avoyd all intime conversation or fellowship with unbelievers, by marrying with them, by going to the Idoll Temples, or the like; he concludeth with a manifest allusion to the legall ceremony, *Be ye separate, and touch not the uncleane thing*, or *the uncleane things* as the Syriacke hath it. *And what agreement hath the Temple of God with idols*, Vers. 16. Where the Syriack readeth thus: *And what agreement hath the Temple of God with the temple of Divels?* Remember, would the Apostle say, that as under the Law, the touching or eating of uncleane things made those that touched them, or did eate of them to be uncleane; so doth your fellowship with unbelievers, or your eating in their Idoll temples defile you. And as then those that had touched any uncleane thing were not received into the Sanctuary, so I will not receive you into fellowship with me and my people, saith the Lord, except you be separate from the sonnes of Belial. Therefore *touch not the uncleane thing, and I will receive you*: Which is not spoken of receiving us into Heaven, but of receiving us into the Tabernacle of God in this life, as is manifest by *Levit.* 26. 11, 12. the place cited by the Apostle in the words immediately preceding. *And I will set my Tabernacle among you, and my soule shall not abhorre you. And I will walke among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* And in this manner, God saith he will not receive us, except we avoid fellowship with the workers of iniquity, especially in holy things.

I shall adde *fourthly*, for further cleering of this point in hand, *Peters* vision, and the interpretation thereof *Act.* 10. & 11. a passage cited by *Erastus* pag. 138, 139. while he is proving, that

that the thing signified by the legall uncleanneſſe, was onely the corruption and Infidelity of nature which excludeth a ſinner from heaven. The place is ſo farre from proving what he would, that it proveth the contrary; for it ſpeaketh plainly of that uncleanneſſe which excludeth men from fellow-ſhip with the Saints in this life; from companying together, from eating together. And when *Peter* expoundeth the viſion, he ſaith, *ye know how that it is an unlawfull thing for a man that is a Iew to keep company, or to come unto one of another Nation: but God hath ſhewed me that I ſhould not call any man common or unclean,* meaning for being a Gentile and not a *Iew. Act.* 10. 28. you ſee, the not eating nor touching of unclean Beaſts, Birds, and creeping things (ſuch as *Peter* ſaw in the viſion) was underſtood by the people of God, as forbidding their aſſociation or fellowſhip in this world with Heathens, or irreligious perſons, and ſuch as walked not according to the Law. And in this ſence the Law was underſtood, not onely by *Peter*, but generally by the Jews *Act.* 11. 3. *Gal.* 2. 12.

Nay fifthly, the legall uncleanneſſe, in the ſence of the Jewes, did ſignifie not onely ſuch things as did exclude others from fellow-ſhip with them, but ſuch as did exclude the Jewes themſelves from the holy things. Therefore it is ſaid *Io.* 18. 28. *they themſelves went not into the Judgement hall, leſt they ſhould be defiled: but that they might eat the Paſſeover:* Intimating that if they had gone into the houſe of an uncircumciſed man, or had upon ſuch a day gone into the Judgement Hall about a litigious action, they had been unclean, and ſo might not eat the Paſſeover. Whether it were the coming into the houſe of *Pilate*, he being a man uncircumciſed; or [t] whether it were (which I rather think) a litigious action upon a Holy-day, which might have defiled them: this is plaine, that they thought there was a morall uncleanneſſe (ſignified by the ceremoniall uncleaneſſe) which might keep men from the Paſſeover.

(t) *Toſtatus* in Matth. 26. *quæſt.* 48. Etiam actus quidam præter contactum, reddebant homines immundos ad manducandum agnum, vel quæcunque ſanctificata, ſicut litigare judicialiter, vel intrare in locum Judicii ad litigandum, ſic dicitur *Io.* 18. *Lud. Capelli* ΕΠΙΚΡΙΣΙΣ *de ultimo Chriſti paſchate* p. 25.

Cum itaque hæc una fuerit illarum Traditionum, ut ne die feſto capitali judicio vacarent, cauſa nulla eſt cur existimemus eos ſine neceſſitate voluiſſe proprias conſtitutiones ita pedibus conculcare, & tam ſolennis feſti religionem prophanare. *Caſaubon Exerc. 16. Anno 34. num.* 32. citeth a plaine paſſage in *Maimonides* declaring that they held it unlawfull to judge of capitall caſes upon the perparation to the Sabbath or to a Holy-day.

The

The fifth animadversion shall be this: whereas *Erastus* holdeth *pag.* 106. that under the law every one was judged cleane or uncleane, according to his owne judgement and conscience, aud not according to the Priests, the Lepers onely excepted; Also that when a man had committed any sinne, it was in the free will of the sinner to expiate his sinne when he pleased, and he was no way compelled to it. I answer, If every uncleane person except the Leper was allowed to judge and pronounce himselfcleane when he pleased, then to what purpose did [u] that Law serve *Lev.*7. 20.21. or that whoever was uncleane and had not purified himself, was not to be admitted to come into the Tabernacle, and if he presumed to come, he was to be cut off from the congregation *Num.* 19? By *Erastus* his principles no man should have been cut off, if he had pleaded himself not to be uncleane; and how many would doe so, if that could save them from being cut off? Is it not also plaine from *Levit.* 15. 15. 30. 31. that both men and women who were uncleane by their issues, (not by Leprosie) were to bring an offering to the Priest for their cleansing, otherwise were not to be accounted cleane, but lookt upon as defilers of the Tabernacle in their uncleanness, whatever they might thinke of themselves. So women that were unclean after Child-Birth, had not power to pronounce themselves cleane, and were not free to come to the Sanctuary when they pleased, but they were first to bring a sinne offering, and the Priest was to make atonement for them *Lev.* 12.6.7.8. There was a certaine number of dayes appointed for the cleansing, both of women after Child-Birth, and of men who had an issue, yea, when the dayes of the cleansing were full-filled, they were not free to come unto the Tabernacle, except they brought their offering for atonement. *Lev.* 12.6.7. & 15.*v.* 13.14.15. *Philo* the Jew *de vita Mosis lib.* 3.*pag.*531. tells us there was a certaine definit time, till the expiring whereof, those that were uncleane by a dead body, were excluded from the Temple. *Josephus antiq. Iud. lib.* 3. cap. 10. records the like, not onely of Lepers, but of those that had an issue, or were defiled by the dead, that till the set time was fulfilled, all these were kept back from the congregration.

(u) L'*Empereur annot. in cod. middoth.* p. 40. Arcebantur autem hujusmodi contaminati, donec ea peregissent quæ ad reatum cæremonialem quem contraxerant delendum facerent, atque hac ratione suis magistris morem gessissent. The unclean were not permitted to partake of the sacrifices. *Iosephus de bello Iud lib.*7. c. 17.

The other thing which *Erastus* saith, that it was left free to the

the sinner to expiate his sinne when he pleased, doth no better agree with the Word. for it was commanded that upon the very knowledge of the sinne, the trespasse offering should be brought, and the sinne confessed *Levit.* 4.14.28.& 5.3.4.5.

Sixthly, whereas *Erastus* pag. 105. urgeth the universall Law, by which all are commanded to keep the Passeover except the uncleane, and those in a journey, therefore all others(how flagitious or scandalous soever in their lives) were bound to keep it; I answer. Who knows not, that many universalls in Scripture are to be restricted, and not to be understood as the words at first sound? as *Io.* 2. 10. *every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine*, that is every Master of a feast *Luk.* 13. 15. *doth not each one of you on the Sabbath lose his Oxe or his Asse*; that is each one that hath an Oxe or an Asse; *Io.* 10. 8. *all that ever came before me were Theeves and Robbers*, meaning whoever before him did make himself the true doore, by which the sheep must enter in. So *Ioel.* 2. 28. *I will poure out my spirit upon all flesh*, yet not upon all and every one, but upon those onely whom he receiveth in Covenant. *Rev.* 13. 8. *and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him* (the Beast) *whose names are not written in the Booke of life*; yet there have been many reprobates who neither worshipped the Pope nor knew him: but it is meant of all under the power of the Beast. So when all are commanded to keep the Passeover, it must be understood of all fit persons, and such as were not to be excepted. You will say the Law excepteth none, but the unclean, and those in a journey, therefore all others not excepted were to keep it; for where an exception is made from an universall Rule, that Rule is the more sure and certaine concerning all other particulars not excepted. To that I answer, *Erastus* himself addeth another exception, and that is, of the sick who could not be present. The Hebrewes make divers other exceptions, for they say, *Women and Servants are not bound to appear: but all men are bound except the deaf, and the Dumb, and the Foole, and the little-Child and the Blinde, and the Lame, and the defiled, and the uncircumcised; and the old man, and the sick, and the tender and weake which are not able to goe up on their Feet. All these eleven are discharged &c.* See Ainsworth on *Exo.* 23. 17. And compare this with *Maimonides de Jdolol.* chap. 11. *S.* 4.

11. Sect. 18. where he that hearkens to Sooth-sayers, Wizards, Charmers, and the like, is said to be reckoned among Fooles and Children whose reason is imperfect. Therefore these were to be excepted as well as Fools and Children, and so were other scandalous persons, which I shall prove anon.

A Seventh Animadversion shall be this. *Erastus* in these Arguments of his from the Law, doth confound *Sacraments* with *Sacrifices* (as I touched in the beginning) yea, [x] he argueth expressely, that whoever were admitted to expiate their Sinne by Sacrifices, were thereby admitted to Sacraments, because (saith he) all these Sacrifices were true Sacraments. So he speaketh in other places, that he might seeme to dispute the more appositely for promiscuous admission to the Sacrament of the Lord Supper. [y] But Sacrifices and Sacraments are as different as Giving and Receiving. In Sacrifices man is the giver, God is the Receiver. In Sacraments God is the Giver, Man is the Receiver. In Sacrifices Peace is made with God. In Sacraments it is sealed and supposed to be made. They therefore that hold the Passeover was a Sacrifice (an opinion partly grounded on *Deut.* 16. 2. and partly taken from the Jewes dispersed, who though they observe divers paschall rites, yet they doe not kill the Paschall Lambe, nor keep the Passeover according to the Law, it being to them unlawfull to offer Sacrifices, except in the Land of *Canaan*) have the shorter evasion from *Erastus* his Argument touching the admission to the Passeover. But I have given other answers. And this much shall suffice for answer to the Erastian Arguments drawn from the Law of *Moses*, which some suppose to be the strongest.

(x) *Pag.* 94. Hoc ipso, quod ad expiandum peccatum jubetur adferre Sacrificium, non excluditur à Sacramentis, sed ad ea invitatur; nam omnia hæc Sacrificia erant vera Sacramenta,

(y) *Perens in Levit.* 4. differunt Sacrificium & Sacramentum; quod Sacrificium est obedientia nostra Deo ad mandatum ejus præstita, sive moralis sive cærimonialis cum morali conjuncta: Sacramentum est Signum gratiæ dei erga nos in fide à nobis susceptum.

CHAP. XII.

CHAP. XII.

Fourteen Arguments, to prove that ſcandalous and preſumptuous Offenders againſt the morall Law (though circumciſed and not being legally uncleane) were excluded from the Paſſeover.

THere is ſo much weight laid, both by *Eraſtus* himſelf, and by Maſter *Prynne*, upon the univerſall Law commanding all that were circumciſed to eat the Paſſeover, except ſuch as were legally uncleane, or were in a journey: that I am reſolved, once for all, to demonſtrate againſt them, that men were excluded from the Paſſeover, for ſcandalous and enormous Treſpaſſes againſt the morall Law, as well as for legall uncleanneſſe. Peradventure it will ſeeme to ſome, that I undertake to prove a paradox, and to walke in an untrodden or obſcure Path. Yet my Arguments are ſuch, as I truſt ſhall weigh much with intelligent men.

The firſt Argument ſhall be this. (which is hinted by *Urſinus* and *Pareus Explic. catechit. Queſt.* 85. *art.* 2.) Whoſoever by Gods appointment were excluded from the priviledges of Church Members, and not to be reckoned among the Congregation of Iſrael, thoſe were by Gods appointment excluded from the Paſſeover. But whoſoever committed any ſcandalous ſinne preſumptuouſly, or with an high hand, were by Gods appointment excluded from the priviledges of Church Members and not to be reckoned among the Congregation of Iſrael. *Ergo.* The Propoſition hath this manifeſt reaſon for it. Thoſe *all* who were commanded to eat the Paſſeover, cannot be underſtood to be of a larger extent then the Church of Iſrael: Thoſe therefore who were not to be acknowledged or uſed as Church-Members, were by Gods appointment excluded from the Paſſeover. The Aſſumption is proved from *Numb* 15.30.31. *But the ſoule that doth ought preſumptuouſly (whether he be born in the land, or a ſtranger) the ſame reproacheth the Lord, and that ſoule ſhall*

be cut off from among his people, Because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandement, that soule shall utterly be cut off: his iniquity shall be upon him.

The presumption here spoken of, is not onely the presumption of heart (saith *Cajetan*) of which God onely is Judge, but a presumption manifested in word or work, which he conceives to be intimated by the Hebrew phrase, *with an high hand. Grotius* understands one that either denyes that there is a God, or that the Law was given by God, or after admonition goeth on in his trespasse. But sure he mistakes the punishment, which he understands to be extrajudiciall, and that he who finds one thus
|| sinning presumptuously, may kill him *ex jure Zelotarum*, as *Phinehes* did kill *Zimri* and *Cosbi*.

I have spoken before of the cutting off, which I will not here resume. Onely this, such presumptuous and contumacious sinners were not to be reckoned among the people of God, nor to enjoy the priviledge of Church Members, therefore not admitted to the Passeover.

Secondly, *Iosephus de bello Iud. lib.* 7. cap. 17. speaking of such as were permitted to eat the Passeover, in the time of *Cestius*, doth thus designe them, καθαρῶν ἁπάντων καὶ ἁγίων, *being all of them pure and holy*, not onely pure from legall uncleanesse, but such as were also esteemed holy. But moreover, it is clear from *Io.* 18. 28, *they themselves* (the Jewes) *went not into the Judgement Hall lest they should be defiled: but that they might eat the Passeover:* that the Jewes did so understand the Law, that morall as well as ceremoniall uncleannesse, did render them uncapable of the Passeover: for they had no such ceremoniall Law, that they who come into the Judgement Hall, should be legally or ceremonially uncleane: yet this had disabled them from eating the Passeover: for they held litigious or forensicall
|| actions unlawfull upon a holy day. as *Capellus*, and *Casaubon* (above cited) doe prove. Such a sinfull and scandalous act had kept them back from the Passeover.

Thirdly, if we consult the *Chaldee* paraphrase upon *Exod.* 12. 43. it saith thus. *Every Sonne of Israel, who is an Apostate, shall not eat of it.* And upon the same place Master *Ainsworth* proves out of *Maimonides* that no Apostate nor Idolater was permitted

to

to eat of the Passeover. Yea, some Israelites who were not apostates, nor idolaters, were for a scandalous action excluded from civill, how much more from Ecclesiasticall fellow-ship? See *Maimon*; *of Idolatry* cap. 9. Sect. 15. *With an Israelite, who hath made defection to the worship of Idolls, it is forbidden to have traffique or commerce either in his going or returning: with another Israelite going to the Markets and Faires of Heathens, we are onely forbidden to have commerce in his returning.* If it was unlawfull to them, so much as to have civill commerce with an Israelite coming from the Markets of Heathens (fearing lest he had sold some what which was dedicate to Idolatry, as the reason is there given) although he was no Apostate nor Idolater: it is not easily imaginable, that such a one was freely admitted to the Passeover.

Fourthly, an Israelite though circumcised, and not legally uncleane, yet if he either turned Idolater, or an Heretick, or an Epicurean, was no longer acknowledged to be in Church-Fellowship or Communion, therefore rendred uncapable of the Passeover. *Jf. Abrabanel* in his Book *de capite fidei*, as he sheweth whom they esteemed Apostats or Hereticks *cap.* 12. so he also intimateth that such were excluded from the communion of their Law *Cap.* 3. *dub.* 5. none being acknowledged to be *in the Communion of Israel*, who did not beleeve the Articles of faith professed in the Jewish Church *Cap.* 6. yea, he tells us *Cap.* 24. (which the *Talmud* it self saith *tit. Sanhedrin. cap.* 11. *Sect.* 1.) that Hereticall or Epicurean Israelites were lookt upon as excluded from having portion in the world to come. And as Doctor *Buxtorf* sheweth out of their owne writers, they esteemed an Hereticall Israelite to be so abominable, that they did straight and without delay excommunicate him. *Lexic. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin.* pag. 195. How is it then imaginable that they admitted such a one to eat the Passeover? Let us heare *R. Moses Maimonides* himself *de Idololatria* cap. 2. Sect. 8. *An Idolatrous Israelite is as an Heathen in all things which he doth* &c. *So also Israelites who are Epicures are not esteemed to be Israelites in any action of theirs* &c. *Now they are Epicures who aske counsell from the thoughts of their own mind, being Ignorant of those things we have spoken of, untill having transgressed the chief heads of the Law, they*

offend by contumacy and presumption, and say there is no sinne in this thing. But it is forbidden to speake with them or to answer them; for it is said, come not neer the door of her house Prov. 5. 8. Therefore the whorish woman that *Solomon speakes of*, was (in the opinion of *Maimonides*) such a one as was not to be esteemed as an Israelite, nay nor such as was to be spoken with, much lesse to be admitted to the Passeover. yea, *Maimonides de Idol.* cap: 10. *Sect.* 2. saith yet more. *But those Israelites which forsake their religion, or become Epicures we are bidden kill them and persecute them even unto hell.* How could they then admit to the passeover those whom they thought themselves obliged to persecute even unto hell?

Fifthly, those Arguments which prove an exclusion of known prophane persons from the Temple, will also prove an exclusion of known prophane persons from the Passeover: for none might eat of the Passeover, who might not also come into the Temple. That scandalous prophane persons might not come into the Temple, hath been proved already.

Sixthly, I argue from the lesser to the greater. If men were to be kept back for legall uncleanesse, much more for morall uncleanesse, this being more hatefull to God and more hurtfull to men then the other. This just consequence *Grotius annot. in* Luk. 6. 22. doth admit. If by the Law saith he, one that was leprous or had a filthy scab, was separated from mens company, lest he should infect others, it was no ill consequence that (if no heavier thing) this at least should be imposed on flagitious & wicked persons, who did by the contagion of their sinfull example hurt others, & bring a reproach upon the whole congregation from which the congregation could not be made free, but by some publik detestation of that wickednes. thus *Groti:*

Seventhly, the purging out of leven from the Congregation of Israel, was a significant teaching Ceremony, holding forth this duty, that the Church ought to put away wicked persons from among them; for so doth the Apostle expound it 1. *Cor.* 5. vers. 6. 7. *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lumpe? purge out therefore the old leaven.* Which relateth not onely to the purging of their own hearts, but to the purging of the Church, and the putting away of that wicked person, this being the

scope

ſcope of the whole Chapter. Now the morall ſignification of that ceremony of purging out the leaven, did concerne the Church of *Iſrael* as well as the Chriſtian Church; even as the divers waſhings under the Law did teach and hold forth the duty of ſanctification and purity to the people of God at that time, as well as typifie the ſanctification of the Chriſtian Church.

Eighthly, though the hallowed bread might in caſe of neceſſity be lawfully given to *David* and his men, (the *Ceremonials* of the firſt Table yeelding to the *Subſtantials* of the ſecond) yet *Abimelech* the Prieſt would not adventure to give it, till he underſtood that the young men had then kept themſelves at leaſt from women, 1 *Sam.* 21.4,5,6. this being a part of that ſanctification which was required in thoſe who did partake of holy things, not onely among the Hebrews, but among other Nations, as *Hugo Grotius* noteth upon the place, and upon *Exod.* 19. 15. Now the Shew-bread, or the twelve loaves which did ſhew or preſent the people to God, can not be ſuppoſed to be holier then the Paſchall Lambe which did ſhew or preſent Chriſt to the people, and was a Sacrament or Seale of the covenant of grace. *David* alſo and his men in that danger of their lives had as good right to eate the Shew-bread, as any Iſraelite could pretend to for his eating the Paſſeover: yea that was a ſubſtantiall duty of the ſecond Table, which Chriſt himſelfe juſtifieth: this was a ceremoniall duty of the firſt Table, and grounded on a poſitive law. This therefore doth afford me an argument with manifold advantages. For if the Shew-bread might not be given to *David* and his men in their extreame neceſſity, unleſſe they had for a certaine ſpace before abſtained from the uſe of their wives, otherwiſe lawfull: how much leſſe might the Paſſeover be given as an holy Ordinance (which did not concern the ſaving of mens lives in extreame neceſſity) to ſcandalous perſons living in known whordome and adultery?

Ninthly, I argue from that place, *Ezech.* 22.26. *Her Prieſts have violated my law and have prophaned mine holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and prophane.* Will any man ſay that they were to put a difference between the holy and prophane

prophane in other Ordinances, and not in the Passeover? and why not in the Passeover, as well as in other Ordinances? If such difference was to be put in the Passeover, then how shall one imagine that no man was kept backe from the Passeover because of known prophanesse or morall uncleannesse? for what difference was put between the holy and prophane, when the prophane were received as well as the holy? Mr *Coleman* held that this Text reacheth not to the keeping pure of the Ordinances by any act of government, but onely that the Priests did prophane the holy things in their owne practice, by eating in their uncleannesse, and also in their ministery because they taught not the children of *Israel* to put a difference between the cleane and the uncleane. *Maledicis* pag. 11. But the Text gives not the least ground to restraine this fault of the Priests here reproved, either to their personall actions, or to their doctrinall ministery. Nay the Text will reach to an act of government neglected; for the word here used to expresse the *distinguishing* or *putting of a difference* between the holy and prophane is בָּדַל which is often used in Scripture to expresse an act of government or authority, whereby one person is separated or distinguished from another person, or one thing from another thing, as *Ezra* 8.24. *Then I separated twelve of the chiefe of the Priests, &c. Ezra* 10. 8. *all his substance should be forfeited, and himselfe separated from the congregation.* Here it signifieth such a separation, as was a publique censure: why not also *Ezech.* 22.26? The same word is used in the story of the division of the Land by *Joshua, Josh.* 16.9. *And the separate Cities for the children of Ephraim.* It is used also to expresse Gods dividing of light from darknesse, *Genes.* 1. 4. also his separating of *Israel* from all other Nations, *Levit.* 20.24. And whereas Mr *Coleman* did take hold of the following words in that place of *Ezechiel*, *neither have they shewed difference between the uncleane and the cleane*, as being meerly doctrinall. First, (if it were so) how will it appeare that these words are exegeticall to the former, and that the putting of difference between the holy and prophane, mentioned in the former words, was onely meant of shewing the difference doctrinally?

or

or why may we not rather understand, that the Priests are charged with neglect of duty both in Doctrine and Government. Secondly, even that latter word הוֹרוּ *fecerunt scire*, the Septuagints render διέστειλαν: and they use διαστέλλω as Synonymous with χωρίζω, ἀφορίζω, διορίζω, διαιρέομαι, ἀποχωρίζω; by all these (signifying to separate or to divide) they render בָּדַל yea the Septuagints expresse a forensicall censure or judiciall separation by διαστέλλω as *Ezra* 10 8. καὶ αὐτὸς διασταλήσεται. So that when they retaine the same word in rendering יָדַע in this Text of *Ezekiel*, they doe thereby intimate that the latter word will reach a power which was more then doctrinall, as well as the former. Which I doe the rather assert, because יָדַע is taken by the Septuagints (not seldome) as agreeing in signification with יָעַד *de voluntate sua certiorem reddidit, constituit, decrevit:* so that it will reach the making of others to know a thing, not onely doctrinally, but by rules, Canons, Statutes, and Government. Yea יָדַע will reach the teaching or making men to know by censures or punishments inflicted, as *Judg.* 8. 16. *Gedeon* tooke briars and thornes יָדַע *Pagnin, & confregit.* and he brake with these the men of *Succoth. Hierome, & contrivit.* The Septuagints κατέξανεν *comminuit.* The English Translation, *and with these he taught* (in the Margent *made to know*) the men of *Succoth.* For this signification of the word, namely *conterere, Arias Montanus* in his Hebrew Lexicon citeth *Isa.* 53. 3. *Ezech.* 19. 7. So *conteri Psalm* 74. 5. *Prov.* 10. 9. Upon this last place *Mercerus* tels us that the Hebrews doe not onely admit this sence of that Text, but in other places also take the same word *pro confringi.* So that without the least violence to the Text in *Ezekiel* it may be thus read; *They have not separated (or put difference) between the holy and prophane, neither have they broken (or divided) between the uncleane and the cleane.* The latter part seemeth to charge the Priests with the admission of such as were legally uncleane; the former part, with the admission of such as were morally uncleane or prophane, to such ordinances as were appointed onely for the holy and cleane.

Tenthly, Heathens or strangers who were not *Proselytes of the covenant or of righteousnesse*, were not permitted to eate of the Passe-

Passeover. Now one that is by profession a Church member, but living in prophanesse and scandalous wickednesse, ought to be esteemed as an Heathen, *Matth.* 18.17. yea as worse than an Infidell, 1 *Tim.* 5.8. Hence was it that the word Heathen was used for an irreligious or wicked man, as is observed by *Mathias Martinius in lexic. philol. pag.* 717. 718. and as a discriminating name from believers; so *Zonaras in Conc. Carthag. Can.* 24. When *David* speaks of his persecuting wicked enemies, // though Israelites, he cals them strangers and heathen, *Psal.* 54.3. // *Psal.* 59.5. How then can it be supposed, that those who were esteemed as heathens, were admitted to all Church priviledges, as well as the best Israelites?

Eleventhly, that which was among the Jewes a sufficient cause to deny circumcision to him who desired to be admitted and received into the Jewish Church as גֵּר בֶּן־בְּרִית *Ger ben berith, a proselyte, sonne of the covenant*, or גֵּר צֶדֶק *Ger tsedeck, a proselyte of righteousnesse*, was also a sufficient cause to deny the Passeover to a proselyte who desired to eate it. Even as now that for which we may and ought to refuse Baptisme to one that desireth it, must needs be also a cause and reason to refuse the Lords Supper to him that desireth to receive it; for he that is not fit to be baptized, is muchlesse fit to receive the Lords Supper. But prophanesse or a scandalous conversation was among the Jewes a sufficient cause and reason to refuse Circumcision. Yea as Dr *Buxtorf* tels us in *Lexic. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin. pag.* 408. before the Jewes would circumcise or baptize a proselyte (for after circumcision they did baptize him) they did first examine him exactly, and prove him narrowly, whether he desired to be a proselyte, from covetousnesse, ambition, feare, the love of an Israelitish virgin, or the like sinister end. If upon examination it did appeare that he was not moved by any worldly consideration, but by affection to Religion and the glory of God, then they proceeded to set before his eyes the strictnesse of the law, and how strait and narrow a path he must walke in, telling him also of the persecutions and tribulations of *Israel*. If after all this triall they found him stedfast in his desires and resolutions, then they received him, he being

ing first instructed in the Articles of their faith, and in the Commandements of the Law. How much lesse would they have circumcised a scandalous person, being so farre from any hopefull signes of sincerity, that he had the blacke markes of a worker of iniquity? And if they would not receive such a scandalous flagitious person to circumcision, how could they receive such a one (being circumcised) to the Passeover?

Twelfthly, compare *Ezra* 6.21. with *Ezra* 10.16,17. First it is marked *Ezra* 6.21. that such proselytes did eate the Passeover with the children of *Israel*, *as had separated themselves unto them from the filthinesse of the Heathen of the Land, to seeke the Lord God of Israel.* If those who did eate were thus qualified, it is not obscurely intimated, that those who were not thus qualified did not eate. And if no proselyte who did not separate himselfe from the filthinesse of the Heathen, was allowed to eat the Passeover, then muchlesse was an Israelite who did not separate himselfe from the filthynesse of the Heathen, allowed to eat it. I like well *Beda* his observation upon *Ezra* 10.16,17. *Israel* was purged from unlawfull marriages, and the strange wives put away; and this worke was ended against the beginning of the first moneth, to the intent that none defiled with unlawfull mariages might eate the Passeover, *Ut ante initium mensis primi consummarentur omnes qui prophano erant connubio maculati, id est a tali scelere purgarentur, quatenus ipsum mensem primum in quo erat pascha faciendum, mundi intrarent, mundi paschalia festa peragerent &c.*

Thirteenthly, I argue from the signification of the legall or ceremoniall uncleanesse, and from that which was signified by the exclusion of those that were legally uncleane. Without all controversie the keeping backe of such, was a significant ceremony. For all the legall ceremonies concerning cleanesse or uncleanesse were teaching ceremonies, and are therefore called *Doctrines*, *Matth.*15.9. *Col.*22.2. What was taught and signified thereby, I have before shewed, namely, that prophane ones be not admitted to fellowship with Gods people in their holy things. Yea, was not prophanesse and open wickednesse more hatefull to God than legall uncleanesse? yes saith *Erastus* pag. 144. becaus God appointed greater punishments for the

former then for the latter: the greater crimes were punished by fire and sword, stoning, hanging; the smaller by mulcts, and stripes. But yet (say I) by his grounds the legall uncleanesse was more hatefull to God than prophanesse and wickednesse, in reference to fellowship in the holy things, (for that is the point) He holds that the most flagitious and prophane were commanded of God to eate the Passeover, and yet those that were onely legally uncleane were forbidden: though the Scripture say, *Prov.*15.8. & 21.27. that the Sacrifice of the wicked is abomination to the Lord, and the oblations of those whose hands were full of blood, his soule hated, and he could not away with them: *Isa.*1.11,12,13,14. and when they came to his house, he told them, *When ye come to appeare before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts?*

I shall not need to insist here, upon the excluding of bond servants, and those that were bought with money, from the Passeover, and the admitting onely of those that were free. Which [z] some of the *Zurik* Divines themselves have interpreted to signifie the exclusion of those who are servants of sinne, and of those who seeke onely the things of the earth. But there is one argument more (it shall be the last) which doth convince me, that others besides the uncircumcised, and they that were legally uncleane, even those that had scandalously transgressed the morall Law, were excluded from the Passeover. The ground of my argument is that whereof I have spoken before, the law for confession of sinne and declaration of repentance; without which the Trespasse-offering was not accepted *Levit.*5.5,6. which Law is extended to every knowne sinne that was to be expiated by Sacrifice, *Numb.*5.6,7. *When a man or woman shall commit any sinne that men commit, to doe a trespasse against the Lord* (the 70 read, *and despising he despise*; to note rebellion or contumacy) *and that person be guilty* (that is be found guilty, or when the sinne shall be known, so the phrase of being guilty is explained, *Levit.* 4.13,14.) *Then they shall confesse their sinne which they have done.* After which followes restitution to the party wronged, and atonement made by the Priest. Whence I argue thus. If the scandalous persons were not admited to the Trespasse offering (which was a reconciling Ordinance) without

b *Lavater hom. 23 in Ezram.*

out confeſſion of their ſinne, which was knowne to have been committed by them, much leſſe were they admitted to the Paſſeover (which was a ſealing Ordinance) without ſuch confeſſion of their ſinne. But ſcandalous perſons were not admitted to the Treſpaſſe-offering, (which was a reconciling Ordinance) without confeſſion of their ſinne which was known to have been committed by them. Therefore much leſſe were they admitted to the Paſſeover, (which was a ſealing Ordinance) without ſuch confeſſion. This argument I did before Chap. 10. vindicate from Mr. *Prynne*. I will here further ſtrengthen it, and vindicate it from another exception, which peradventure will be made againſt it. The propoſition is certaine: for ſome are called to make their peace with God, who can not have any aſſurance ſealed unto them, that their peace is made with God; But if God will not be reconciled, he will farre leſſe ſeale reconciliation. *There is no peace to the wicked* ſaith God, how much leſſe can their peace be ſealed to them? The aſſumption is manifeſt from the Scriptures laſt cited. And if any ſhall ſay that the Law, *Levit.* 5. is meant onely of private ſinnes, and thoſe of ignorance, which ſo ſoon as they come to knowledge, are to be confeſſed. I anſwer. 1. Its more then can be proved, that onely private ſinnes and thoſe of ignorance are there meant of. Of this I have ſpoken elſewhere. But be it ſo. If ſome private ſinnes, yea ſinnes of ignorance were to be publiquely confeſſed when they were known, how much more were publique and ſcandalous ſins to be publiquely confeſſed? 2. The Hebrews underſtand the Law of confeſſion to be extended to all ſinnes whatſoever that were expiated by Sacrifice, and that before atonement could be made, the ſinner muſt make confeſſion and ſay, *O God I have ſinned, and done perverſely, I have treſpaſſed before thee, and have done thus and thus: and lo I repent and am aſhamed of my doings, and I will never doe this thing againe.* 3. In all Sacrifices for atonement or expiation a man laid his hand upon the head of his offering, *Levit.* 1. 4. *Exod.* 29. 10, 15, 19. This laying on of hands was the rite uſed in confeſſion of ſinne, whereby a man did profeſſe that he was worthy to be deſtroyed for his ſinne, and that he laid his ſinne upon the beaſt which was

killed in his stead, thereby figuring that upon Christ are laid the iniquities of us all. And with the laying on of hands upon the Sacrifice, confession of sinne was made by word of mouth; which as it is the judgement of [a] Interpreters, so it is easily proved from *Levit.*16.21. *And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live Goat, and confesse over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sinnes, putting them upon the head of the Goat.* Whereupon I conclude, that any sinne which was expiated by Sacrifice, whether a publique or secret offence, was confessed before it was expiated. 4. The Law *Numb.*5.6. extends confession to any sinne that men commit, as hath been before observed. 5. *Philippus Gamachæus* a learned Doctor of *Sorbon, comment. in tertiam partem Thomæ, de Pœnitentiæ Sacramento cap.* 13. doth ingenuously acknowledge, that the foresaid law of *Moses*, concering confession of sinne, is no warrant for their private auricular, and Sacramentall confession, [b] becaus̃e the Jewes were not by that Law bound to confesse any other sinnes, but sinfull actions or externall transgressions, nor all such, but chiefly the notorious and scandalous sinnes. If he had perceived the least colour of an argument, from that Mosaicall Law, for the necessity of confessing private sinnes to the Priest, surely he had taken hold of it, and had not quit it.

a *Tostatus in Levit.*1. *quæst.* 15. *Ainsworth on Levit.*1.4.

b Deinde nec Judæi confitebantur peccata omnia exactè, accuratè, sicut nos; non enim peccata interna & mentalia, sed solùm externa, quæ opere ipso consummata essent, & in exteriorem actum transiissent &c. Tertiò, nec Judæi omnia externa peccata in confessione declarabant, sed præsertim notoria & publica, ut fert opinio probabilior.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Master *Prynnes Argument from* 1 Cor. 10. (*which he takes to be unanswerable*) *discussed and confuted.*

MAster *Prynne* in the 15. page of his *Vindication* endeavoureth to prove, that spirituall pollution by reason of grosse and scandalous sinnes, did not debarre them that were circumcised from the Passeover. *as* Paul (saith he) *expresely determines* 1 Cor. 10. 1. *to* 10. (*an unanswerable Text to this purpose*) *moreover Brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant that* (the Text saith *how that*) *all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea, & were all Baptized unto* Moses *in the Cloud & in the Sea; and did all eat the same spirituall meat* (*to wit the Passeover and Manna*) *and did all drinke of the same spirituall drinke, for they dranke of the Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ. But perhaps all these Communicants were visible Saints, free from any legall pollution, at least not Tainted with any scandalous sinne: The Apostle to take off this evasion, subjoynes, in the very next words. But with many of them, God was not well pleased,* &c. *So that the Israelites being once circumcised, were all admitted to eat the Passeover, though some of them were Idolaters, others lusters after evill things; others fornicators, others tempters of Christ; others murmurers against God and* Moses. The same argument he hinteth *pag.* 9. to prove the like under the Gospell. It's one of *Erastus* his argments, *Confirm. Thes. pag.* 118. 119. and as colourable as any other, yet not unanswerable as Master *Prynne* holds.

For 1. though he saith the Apostle cleerly determines, that those who were tainted with grosse and scandalous sinnes, were admitted to the Passeover; yet I finde nothing of the Passeover, neither in the Text, nor in the sence of any Interpreter which I have looked upon. Nay, it did not so much as fall in the thoughts of *Erastus* himself; for *Beza* having objected to him that he ought to have compared our Sacraments with the purely sacred Feasts in the old Testament rather than with the manna, and with the water of the Rock, which were for corporall nourishment; *Erastus* replyeth nothing concerning the Passeover (which had been his best answer

if he had seen any probability for it,) onely he saith that he compareth our Sacraments with the manna and the water of the Rock, as the Apostle doth before him.

2. The Text it self seemeth rather to determine clearly, that the Passeover is not there intended: for all the other particulars there mentioned did agree to all the Israelites, men, women, and Children: all these were under the Cloud, and all these passed through the Sea, and all these drank of the water of the Rock; and why shall we not understand, that all these did also eat of the same spirituall meat, that is of the Manna, not of the Passeover, of which women and Children under 13 yeares of age did not eat: neither did all the males above 13 yeares eat of it: for the unclean were excluded by the Law: those that were in a journey did not eat of it nor the hired Servant: the sick saith *Erastus* did not eat of it: the Jewes exclude also the Dumbe and the Deaf. If it be said, that *vers.* 1. speaketh onely of the Fathers, and that therefore the Text is not to be understood of women and Children also. I answer, This is as inconsequent, as if one would argue, *Paul* saith *Men, Brethren, and Fathers*, therefore no women were among that multitude of the people *Act.* 21.35.36.39.40. or thus, the Apostle saith *Brethren pray for us*, therefore he desires not believing Sisters to pray for him. In this same Text in hand the Apostle speakes to the whole Church of *Corinth*, to make them afraid of Gods judgements if they sinne as the Israelites did. If he had argued onely from the sinne and judgement of the men, and not also of the women in the wilderness, the women in *Corinth* had so much the lesse applyed it to themselves. But if I should grant (which will never be proved) that by the Fathers are understood the men onely, yet it cannot be said that as all the men of Israel were Baptized in the Cloud and Sea, and all of them drank of the same spirituall drink which came out of the Rock, so all of them did eat the Passeover: for even of the males divers were excluded from the Passeover, as the unclean, the hired Servant, the Child, the sick, &c. so that this would make the Apostles argumentation running upon a five-fold *all* to hang ill together. I had not insisted at all upon this, but to shew the weak grounds of Mr. *Prynnes* strong confidence.

3. If

3. If this argument of his hold good, he must grant by Analogy that all Baptized persons must be admitted to the Lords Table, though they be Idolaters, fornicators, &c. which as it is contrary to the Ordinance of Parliament, so to his own professed Tenents, for he professeth other where, he is not for the admission of scandalous persons to the Sacrament, and that he would have them in case of obstinacy, not onely suspended from the Sacrament, but excommunicated from all other Ordinances, till publike satisfaction given for the scandall, and till externall symptomes of repentance appear. So *the Antidote animadverted* tells us and his owne *vindication* pag. 50. If this be his minde, then it is incumbent to him to loose his owne knot, all circumcised persons though Tainted with grosse scandalous sinnes, as Idolatry, and Fornication, were admitted to the Passeover, and so it ought to be under the Gospell. If he say that those scandalous sinners in the wilderneſſe had not been admonished, were not obstinate, or that they professed repentance, and promised amendment, and did not in the meane while persevere in their wickednesse, but satisfied for the scandall: first how proves he that? next, in so saying he will answer for us as well as for himself, and his argument (if all granted) cannot prove that such scandalous sinners as have manifest symptoms of impenitency, or doe not confesse and forsake their sinne, may be admitted to the Lords Table.

4. The Manna and the water out of the Rock, though they had a spirituall and evangelicall signification, and dip typifie Jesus Christ, yet they were also the ordinary Food and Drink of the people in the wilderneſſe: so that if scandalous sinners had been excluded from partaking of these, they had been deprived of their ordinary daily corporall nourishment; which makes a vast difference between their case in the wilderneſſe, and ours at the Lords Table.

5. The Apostle speakes of those scandalous sinnes, as committed, not before, but after the eating of that spirituall meat, and drinking of that spirituall drink; first this is cleer of their Baptisme in the Cloud and in the Sea, which was at their passing through the Red Sea, *Exod.* 14. before any of the grosse and scandalous sinnes there mentioned were committed; and there-

therefore was not pertinent to be objected. Immediately thereafter they did eat of the ſpirituall meat, that is of the manna *Exo.* 16. and drank of the ſpirituall drink, that is of the Water out of the Rock which followed them *Exod.* 17. *to give drink to my people, my choſen* ſaith the Lord *Iſa.* 43. 20. Now after thoſe men had eaten of the ſpirituall meat, and drunk of the ſpirituall drink, they did fall into Idolatry, Fornication, &c. and this is all which the Apoſtle ſaith, thereby warning the *Corinthians* not to preſume upon their partaking in the Ordinances, nor to think all well with themſelves, becauſe they were Baptized, and had eaten and drunk at the Lords Table; for after all this they had need to take heed, leſt they fall in foule ſinnes, and luſt after evill things, and ſo draw upon themſelves the heavier judgements. That which Maſter *Pryme* takes for granted (upon a marvellous miſtake of the Apoſtles words) he hath yet to prove, that is, that after ſome of them had fallen into Idolatry, others into fornication, others into murmuring againſt God, thoſe who were known to have committed thoſe groſſe and ſcandalous ſinnes, were allowed and admitted, as before, to eat of the ſpirituall meat, and drink of the ſpirituall drink. I mean not onely the Paſſeover, (which is not at all meant in this Text) but even from the Manna and the water of the Rock thoſe ſcandalous ſinners were cut off by death, except ſuch of them as did repent and turn, for whom atonement was made to God. As ſoon as *Moſes* came into the camp, he gave a charge to ſlay every man his Brother, and every man his companion which had committed the ſinne of Idolatry: and for the reſt who ſurvived *Moſes* made atonement, and got an anſwer of Peace from God, concerning them. *Exo.* 32. & 33. We read alſo that the Lord plagued the people, becauſe of their Idolatry *Exo.* 32. 35. and the people did mourn and humble themſelves and caſt off their Ornaments *Exo.* 33. 4. So that (I am ſure) the firſt caſe mentioned by the Apoſtle maketh much againſt our Oppoſites. The ſecond example is the matter of Peor, where they did fall both into Idolatry and Fornication together; but what came of it? *Moſes* gave a charge to the Judges of Iſrael, to ſlay every one his men that were joyned to *Baal Peor Numb.* 25. 5. and there died alſo of the Plague

Plague 24000. *v.* 9. But what was the peoples part in Repenting? *verſ.* 6. tells us, that *all the congregation of the Children of Iſrael were weeping before the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation*; and for thoſe that remained alive, *Phinehes* made atonement, and the Lord ſmelled a ſavour of reſt *verſ.* 11. 13. As for the third caſe, inſtanced by the Apoſtle, which is the tempting of Chriſt, *much people of Iſrael dyed* for it, and the remnant did repent, and confeſſe that particular ſinne that they had *ſpoken againſt the Lord and againſt* Moſes, and therefore did deſire *Moſes*, to pray unto the Lord for them. *Num.* 21. 6. 7. Laſtly, for that of murmuring, thoſe that had the chiefe hand in it died of the Plague, *Num.* 14. 37. and *the people mourned greatly*, and confeſſed, *We have ſinned verſ.* 34. 40. And thus by ſearching for an Anſwer to our Oppoſites argument, we have found this argument againſt them.

If God himſelf did execute ſuch Diſcipline upon thoſe who were tainted with the groſſe and ſcandalous ſinnes of Idolatry, Fornication, &c. That he would not permit them to enjoy their former liberty of eating of the Manna, and drinking of the Water of the Rock, (being ſpirituall meat, and ſpirituall drink, as Typifying Chriſt, though appointed of God alſo for ordinary daily food and drink to his people) untill they mourned, repented, confeſſed, and atonement was made for them: It is much leſſe the will of God, that ſuch ſcandalous ſinners, as are manifeſtly impenitent and manifeſtly not reconciled to God, ſhould be admitted and received to the Lords Supper, which is an Ordinance purely ſpirituall.

But the former part is true.

Therefore ſo is the latter.

6. Another Anſwer I ſhall adde, (though I need adde no more) Thoſe ſinnes mentioned by the Apoſtle were not ſcandals given by a few perſons, nor yet by a few Families, nor by a Tribe, but they were common nationall ſinnes; and ſo fall not within the verge of our Controverſie, which is not concerning the ſuſpending of a ſcandalous Nation from the Sacrament, for ſome nationall ſinne; but concerning the ſuſpenſion of ſcandalons perſons for their perſonall publike offences. If it

be objected unto me, that the Apostle saith, that some of them were Idolaters, and some of them did commit Fornication, &c. I answer, when he saith *some*, he saith so in reference to the *All* which had gone before, that is, all the Israelites who did eat of the Manna and drink of the water of the Rock, during the 40 yeers in the wildernesse, successively: so that he makes a distribution of Israel in the wildernesse, comparing one passage with another, not distributing those that lived together at one and the same time. And that it must needs be so understood I prove from *Exo.* 32. where we find *all the people* falling into Idolatry, so *Num.* 14.2. *And all the Children of Israel murmured against* Moses *and against* Aaron. The other two are also called the sinnes of the people, and of Israel, and the people were punished, and for one of them all the Heads of the people commanded to be hanged. *Num.* 21.5. 6. & 25.3. 4. Peradventure every one did not act in each of these sinnes, but yet they were nationall (as we call nationall) sinnes, the generality of the Children of Israel, either acting or partaking therein. In such a case *Augustine* thought fit to suspend the exercising of Excommunication for the sinne of drunkennesse rather than to excommunicate all *Africa*.

These are my six answers to Master *Prynnes* unanswerable argument.

The end of the first Book.

AN

APPENDIX

To the First Booke:

Containing an additionall debate concerning the Jewish Church-Government and Censures.

I Have said enough (as I suppose) of a Church-Government and Church-Censures distinct from Magistracy and civill Justice among the Jewes, whereby the seeming Old Testament strength of the Erastians, is sufficiently yea abundantly broken; And now it appeareth how ill grounded that Assertion is which did lately come abroad in the Discourse entituled, *The difference about Church-government ended* Pag. 8. *Moses was first the sole Ruler, &c. Afterwards when Kings reigned in Israel, King Solomon put Abiathar the high Priest from his Office, setting up Zadok, and David distinguished the courses of the Priests, and other godly Kings from time to time ruled in things Ecclesiasticall, and Priests never; till that after their returne from the Babylonish captivity, &c.*

And no better grounded are the first five questions in Mr *Prynne* his *Diotrephes catechised*, in which he doth intimate that there was no distinct Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction among the Jewes, and that all scandalous sinnes and offences now pretended to be of Ecclesiasticall cognisance, were by Gods owne institution throughout the old Testament, inquireable, examinable, determinable, and punishable onely by the temporall Magistrates or civill powers, not by any Ecclesiasticall persons or Officers. But when he should prove that there was no Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction distinct from the civill, he brings many Scriptures to prove that there was a civill jurisdiction and civill or temporall punishments in the Old Testament. How cold the consequence from hence will be, against Church-Government, the intelligent Reader cannot but perceive.

The most of that strength which doth militate against these Erastian Principles, is presented and drawn up in this preceding Booke. That which I now intend is onely an additionall debate.

And first of all it is to be observed that the same point of Controversie is debated[a] with the Anabaptists, they holding as the Erastians doe, that in the old Testament, there was but one kind of government, one kind of jurisdiction, one kind of punishment, and that it was Civill or Temporall; but an Ecclesiasticall Judicature or censure in the old Testament they deny. Wherein they are contradicted by those that writ against them.

[a] See *Ampsingius Disp. adv. Anabapt. pag. 276. Joh. Clappenburg. in Gangræna Theol. Anabapt. part. 3. Disp. 11.*

citeth these words out of a booke of the Anabaptists *de Censur. Eccles. Ante adventum Christi tempore veteris Testamenti, unicum tantum institutum fuisse regimen, ac non nisi unicam punitionem, videlicet à magistratu exercendam secundum scriptam legem à Mose traditam: quâ luendum erat vel in bonis vel in corpore, ac sustinenda aut Mors, aut carcer, aut multa pecuniaria: quæ omnia politici erant, non Ecclesiastici judicii.* In opposition hereunto he addeth. *In Ecclesiis reformatis creditur ex verbo Dei, fuisse à Deo jam olim in V. T. institutum duplex regimen, duplici officio gubernationis, qua politicæ, qua Ecclesiasticæ, distinctum.*

Secondly, we must distinguish with great caution, and (as they say) *cum grano salis*, between that which was ordinary and that which was extraordinary in the Jewish Government. We can not, from extraordinary cases collect and conclude that which was the fixed, setled, ordinary rule. The examples which have been alledged for the administration of Church-Government, the purging away of scandals, the ordering of the

the Miniſtery in the old Teſtament, by the Temporall Magiſtrate or civill powers onely, and by their owne immediate authority, how truly alledged or how rightly apprehended ſhall appeare by and by: this I ſay for the preſent, diverſe of them were extraordinary caſes, and are recorded as preſidents for godly Magiſtrates their duty and authority, [b] not in a reformed and conſtituted Church, but in a Church which is full of diſorders, and wholly out of courſe, needing reformation. So that the Eraſtian Arguments drawn from thoſe examples, for inveſting the Magiſtrate with the whole and ſole power of Government and juriſdiction in Eccleſiaſticall affaires, are no whit better than the Popiſh and Prelaticall Arguments, for the lawfulneſſe of the civill power and places of Clergymen (as they called them) drawne from ſome extraordinary examples of *Aaron* his joyning with *Moſes*, and *Eleazer* with *Joſhua*, in civill buſineſſe of greateſt conſequence; of the adminiſtration and Government of the Commonwealth by *Eli* the Prieſt, and by *Samuel* the Prophet; of the anointing of *Jehu* to be King by *Eliſha*; of the killing of *Athaliah*, and the making of *Joaſh* King by the authority of *Jehojada* the Prieſt; of the withſtanding and thruſting out of King *Uzziah*, by fourſcore valiant men of the Prieſts, and ſuch like caſes. Maſter *Prynne* himſelf in his *Diotrephes catechiſed* pag. 4. noteth that *Ezra* the Prieſt received a ſpeciall commiſſion from *Artaxerxes*, to ſet Magiſtrates and Judges which might judge all the people *Ezra* 7. 11,25. from all which it appeareth that as Prieſts did extraordinary ſome things which ordinarily belonged to Magiſtracy, ſo Magiſtrats did extraordinarily that which ordinarily did not belong to their adminiſtration. I conclude this point with a paſſage in the ſecond book of the Diſcipline of the Church of *Scotland* Chap. 10. *And although Kings and Princes that be godly, ſometimes by their own authority, when the Church is corrupted, and all things out of order, place Miniſters, and reſtore the true ſervice of the Lord, after the example of ſome godly Kings of Judah and divers godly Emperours and Kings alſo in the light of the new Teſtament: yet where the Miniſtery of the Church is once lawfully conſtituted, and they that are placed doe their Office faithfully, all godly Princes and Magiſtrates ought to heare and obey their voyce, and reve-*

[b] *D. Pareus in Deut. 17.* Judicia eccleſiaſtica ad Eccleſiam pertinent ſecundum verbum Dei. Magiſtratus nihilominus eſt cuſtos utriuſque Tabulæ, & ceſſantibus Sacerdotibus vel degenerantibus, debet reformare ſecundum legem.

rence the Majesty of the Sonne of God speaking in them.

In the third place, let us take a particular survey of such Objections, from which the Erastians doe conclude that the power of Church-government in the old Testament was onely in the hand of the Magistrate.

And first concerning *Moses*, it is objected that he being the supreme Magistrate did give Lawes and Ordinances for ordering the Church in things pertaining to God.

Answ. This he did as a Prophet from the mouth of the Lord, yea as a type of Jesus Christ the great Prophet, *Deut.* 18. 15. 18. not as civill Magistrate.

2. *Object.* We read not of an Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin adjoyned with *Moses*, but onely of a civill Sanhedrin *Num.* 11. Neither doth the Talmud mention any supreme Sanhedrin but one.

Answ. 1. If those 70 Elders, *Num.* 11. be understood onely of the civill Sanhedrin, (which some doe not admit, though for my part I doe not gainsay it) yet we read of the constitution of another Sanhedrin or Assembly of 70 before them. Which I have before proved from *Exod.* 24. 1.

2. And if there had been no distinct Ecclesiasticall Sanhedrin in *Moses* his time, yet by the Law, *Deut.* 17. when the people came into the Land of promise, they were to have two distinct Courts in the place which the Lord should choose. Of which also before. And whereas Mr *Prynne* in his *Diotrephes catechised quæst.* 2. intimateth, that by the Law *Deut.* 17. the Priests were onely joyntly and together with the temporall Judges, to resolve hard civill cases or controversies: this sence can neither agree with the disjunction in the Text verse 12. the man that will not hearken *unto the Priest, or unto the Judge:* nor yet with the received interpretation of those words *between stroke and stroke*, that is, *between leprosie and leprosie*, the decision whereof, is no where in Scripture found to be either committed unto or assumed by the civill Judge. As for the Talmud, that
|| of *Babylon* was not begun to be compiled before the yeere of
|| Christ 367, nor finished before the yeere of Christ 500. The *Jerusalem* Talmud can pretend to no greater antiquity than the yeere of Christ 230. So that both were collected long after the dissolution of the Sanhedrin and government of the Jewes. No marvell

marvell therefore, if these declining times did weare out the memory of some part of their former government.

3. *Object.* The King was by Gods appointment entrusted with the custody of the booke of the Law, *Deut.* 17 18. 2 *King.* 11. 12.

Answ. 1. The principall charge of the custody of the Law was committed to the Priests and Levites, *Deut.* 31. 9, 24, 25 26. Of the King it is onely said *Deut.* 17. 18. *That he shall write him a coppy of this law in a Booke, out of that which is before the Priests and Levites.*

2. I heartily yeeld that a lawfull Magistrate, whether Christian or Heathen, ought to be a keeper or guardian of both Tables, and as Gods Vicegerent hath authority to punish haynous sinnes against either Table, by civill or corporall punishments which proves nothing against a distinct Church-government for keeping pure the Ordinances of Christ.

4. *Object.* King *David* did appoint the Offices of the Levites and divided their courses 1 *Chro.* 23. So likewise did *Solomon* appoint the courses and charges of the Priests, Levites and Porters in the Temple.

Answ. David did not this thing as a King, but as a Prophet, 2 *Chro.* 8. 14. *For so had David the man of God commanded*: the same thing being also commanded by other Prophets of the Lord, 2 *Chro.* 29 25. *According to the commandement of David, and of Gad the Kings seer, and Nathan the Prophet, for so was the commandement of the Lord by his Prophets.* Which cleareth also *Solomons* part, for (beside that himselfe also was a Prophet) he received from *David* the man of God, a patterne of that which he was to doe in the worke of the house of the Lord, and directions concerning the courses of the Levites, 1 *Chro.* 28. 11, 12, 13. 2 *Chro.* 8. 14.

5. *Object.* King *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar* from his Priesthood, and did put *Zadok* in his place.

Answ. Abiathar was guilty of high treason for assisting and ayding *Adonijah*, against *Solomon*, whom not onely his father *David* but God himselfe had designed to the Crowne. So that the crime was of civill cognizance, and *Abiathar* deserved to die for it. That which *Solomon* did was an ἐπιείκεια, a moderation of the punishment, as *Strigelius* cals it; when *Solomon* might

might justly have put him to death, he onely banisheth him from *Hierusalem* to *Anathoth*, there to enjoy his owne inheritance, to live a private life, and no more to intermeddle in State affaires. Wherefore this example doth belong to the case of a capitall crime committed by a Minister, but not to the case of scandall or mal-administration in his Ministery.

2. Neither did *Solomon* directly or intentionally put *Abiathar* from the Priesthood for that offence, but by consequence it followed upon his banishment from *Hierusalem*, the place where the high Priest was to exercise his calling, 1 *King.* 2.27. *So* (that is, in respect of banishment from *Ierusalem* mentioned in the verse immediately preceding) *Solomon thrust out Abiathar from being Priest unto the Lord.* A Minister now banished is not thereby thrust out from all exercise of his Ministery, for he may exercise it in another place; but *Abiathar* being thrust out from *Hierusalem* was *eo ipso* thrust from the calling of the high Priest, which was necessarily to be exercised in that place.

3. *Solomon* being a Prophet, who knowes what warrants he had more then ordinary for that which he did to *Abiathar?* that it was not without an extrordinary divine instinct, some collect from the next words; *that he (Solomon) might fulfill the word of the Lord which he spake concerning the house of Eli in Shilo.*

4. As for the investing of *Zadok* with the place and authority of the high Priest, it doth not prove that the Magistrate hath a constitutive power to make or authorize Church officers: for *Zadok* had been formerly chosen by the congregation of Israel, and anointed to be high Priest, 1 Chro. 29. 22. yea he did fall to the place *Jure divino:* for the high Priesthood was given to *Eleazar* the eldest sonne of *Aaron*, and was to remaine in the family of *Eleazar*, from whom *Zadok* had lineally descended: Whereas *Abiathar* was not of the family of *Eleazar*, but of the family of *Ithamar.*

6. *Object. Hezekiah* did apply his regall power to the reformation of the Levites and to the purging of the Temple, 2 Chr. 29.5. and did also appoint the courses of the Priests and Levites every man according to his service, 2 Chro. 31. So likewise did King *Josiah*, 2 Chro. 35.

Answ. Hezekiah in exhorting the Levites to sanctifie themselves

ſelves and to cleanſe the Temple, doth require no other thing than the Law of God did require, *Num.* 8. 6. 11. 15. & 18. 32. which *Hezekiah* himſelfe pointeth at, 2 *Chro.* 29. 11. And why ſhould not the Magiſtrate command Miniſters to do the duties of their calling according to the Word of God? As for his appointing of the courſes of the Prieſts and Levites, he did nothing therein, but what the Lord had commanded by his Prophets, 2 *Chro.* 29. 25. The like I anſwer concerning King *Joſiah*, for it is recorded, that what hee did, was after the writing of *David* and *Solomon*, 2 Chro. 35. 4. and *according to the Commandement of* David *and* Aſaph, *and* Heman, *and* Jeduthun, *the Kings ſeer*, Verſe 15. *as it is written in the booke of* Moſes, *v.* 12.

7. *Object.* King *Joaſh* while hee yet did right in the dayes of *Iehoiada* the Prieſt, ſent the Prieſts and Levites to gather from all Iſrael, a collection for repairing the houſe of the Lord, and when they dealt negligently in this buſineſſe he diſcharged them to receive any more money ſo collected.

Anſ. *Joaſh* did impoſe no other collections, but thoſe *quæ divino jure debebantur*, *which were due by divine right*, ſaith *Wolphius*, in 2 *Kings* 12. The thing was expreſſely commanded in the Law of *Moſes*, compare 2 *Chro.* 24. 6. *Exo.* 30, 12, 13, 14. As for the Kings prohibition afterwards laid upon the Prieſts, 1 the Prieſts had ſtill neglected the worke till the three and twentieth yeare of his raigne was come, 2. The Prieſts themſelves conſented to receive no more money, 3. The high Prieſt had ſtill a chiefe hand in the managing of that buſineſſe, in which alſo the Prieſts that kept the doore had an intereſt. All which is plaine from 2 *Kings* 12. 6. 8, 9, 10. And beſide all this, it was a money matter, concerning the hyring and paying of workemen, and ſo did belong to τὰ ἔξω, to the extrinſecall, not to the intrinſecall things of the Church.

8. *Object.* The Kings of the Jewes have purged the Land from Idolatry and Superſtition, have broken downe Altars, cut down Groves, deſtroyed high places, and ſuch like Idolatrous Monuments.

Anſ. This was nothing but what was commanded in the Law of *Moſes*, whereunto alſo the ſecular coercive power was neceſſary.

Let

Let it be remembled concerning those godly reforming Kings of *Iudah* 1. The case was extraordinary, no matter of ordinary Government. 2 Their reformation was *Iure divino*. The Law of God was the rule, and *Ius Divinum* was not then startled at, but embraced. 3. Sometime also the reformation was not without an assembly of the Prophets, Priests and Elders, as 2 *Kings* 23.1.

9. *Object.* Mr. *Prynne* in his *Diotrephes Catechised, Quest.* 2. starteth another objection from 2 *Chr.* 19. asking, *whether it be not clearly meant, that as King* Iosiah *himselfe* (he should have said *Iehoshaphat*) *did by his owne regall authority, appoint Iudges in the Land and in* Ierusalem, *in the preceeding* 5,6,7,8,9. *&* 10. *Verses, to determine all controversies and punish all offences whatsoever, according to the Lawes of God and that Kingdome, so hee did by the selfe same regall authority appoint* Amariah *then chiefe Priest, over the Priests and Levites onely* (*implyed in the word* you, *not over the people of the Land*) *in all matters of the Lord, that is, to Order, direct the Priests and Levites, under him in their severall courses, and all matters whatsoever concerning the Worship, &c.*

Ans. 1. Mr. *Prynne* will never prove from that Text, That *Iehoshaphat* by his regall authority did appoint, or set *Amariah* the chiefe Priest to be over the rest; The English translators expresse the sence by interlacing the word *is* Verse 11. *And behold* Amariah *the chiefe Priest is over you in all matters of the Lord.* 2. To restrict the word *you* to the Priests and Levites onely, is an intolerable wresting of the Text; for all these relatives, Verse 9,10, 11. *them, ye, you,* must needs repeat the antecedent Verse 8. and so relate to the chiefe of the Fathers of Israel, as well as to the Priests and Levites. So that these words, *Amariah the chiefe Priest is over you,* are spoken to the Sanhedrin; and the plaine meaning is, that *Amariah* the chiefe Priest was at that time the *Nasi*, or *princeps Senatus*, the Prince or chiefe Ruler of the Senat, as *Grotius* expounds it. 3. That the high Priest was a Ruler of the People, as well as of the Priests and Levites, is manifest from, *Acts* 23.5. where *Paul* applieth to the high Priest, that Law, *Thou shalt not speake evill of the Ruler of thy people.* 4. Wherefore to retort the Objection, Mr. *Prynne*

doth

doth here acknowledge upon the matter two distinct Governments to have beene at that time, one civill, another Ecclesiasticall: distinct I say both *objectively*, and *subjectively*: *objectively*, for hee expounds *the Lords matters* to be meant of the sacrifices and other services in the Temple, *The Kings matters* hee takes to be the Kings *Houshould*, *Lands*, *Revenues*: *Subjectively* also, for hee yeeldeth upon the matter both *Amariah* and *Zebadiah* to have had a certaine ruling or governing power in ordering and directing these over whom they were set, which well agreeth both with the version of the 70 (giving the name of ἡγούμενος both to the one and to the other) and with the Originall; for he that is over the Sanhedrin it selfe must needs be a Ruler.

10. *Object.* The causes of Leprosy, *Lev.*13.& 14. and jealousie *Num.*5. are *the onely cases wherein the Priests were appointed to be as Iudges in the Old Testament*. So Mr. *Prynne* in his *Diotrephes catechised quest.*3.

Ans. 1. If the Priests were Judges in these cases, then (so farre at least) there was a judging, decisive, binding sentence of the Priests, distinct from and not subordinate unto the civill Magistracy. 2. But that these two were the onely cases wherein the Priests were appointed to be as Judges, is easily confuted, being an assertion contrary to diverse Texts of Scripture, as first *Deut.*21.5. in the triall of secret murther the Law appointeth thus: *And the Priests the sonnes of Levi shall come neare,&c. and by their word shall every controversy and every stroke bee tried*, that is, every controversy which was to be ended by purgations or purifications, Oathes or confession, as *Pelargus* noteth upon the place. There is also a generall comprehensive expression concerning the Priests their judging and deciding of controversies forensically, *Ezech.*44. 24. *And in controversy they shall stand in judgement, and they shall judge it according to my judgements.* Likewise *Deut.*17.8,9,12. the Priest as well as the Judge hath authority to give forth a binding decree concerning hard matters, brought from inferior Courts to *Ierusalem*. Againe 2 *Chron.*23.19. the Porters of the Temple (that is, *the Priests that kept the doore* as they are designed 2 *Kings* 12.9. of whom also it is said, that *Iehojadah* the high Priest,

appointed Officers over the house of the Lord, 2 *Kings* 11.18. which Text *Grotius* following *Josephus* doth parallell with 2 *Chro.* 23.19.) had this charge, *that none which was unclean in any thing should enter in.*

11. *Object.* If the Priests power of judging reached further than the cases of Leprosie, and Jealousie, the most was to judge of such as were uncleane in any thing, and that according to their sentence the uncleane were to be excluded.

Anſ. Not to insist now upon these Texts, *Deut.* 17.9.12. & 21.5. *Ezs.* 44.24. which hold forth the juridicall power of the Priests more generally and comprehensively, without restricting it to cases of cleane and uncleane only; nor yet to repeat diverse other answers before given, in answer to *Erastus* and M. *Prynne,* concerning legall and morall uncleanesse; I shal here only give this one answer out of that Text 2 *Chro.* 23. 19. *none which was unclean in any thing.* What cogent argument can now restrict this Text concerning the exclusion of uncleane persons from the Temple, to such only who were legally or ceremonially unclean? If we should suppose and grant that it is meant onely of the legall uncleanesse, yet both by Analogy and à *fortiori,* that Text affoordeth an argument against the Erastians, and I have accordingly made use of it before; Yet nevertheless I believe it will puzle them to prove that this Text doth uot comprehend those also that were morally uncleane, that is, scandalous prophane persons. For my part I doe believe that it is meant of keeping back those that were morally unclean, as well as those that were ceremonially such. And my reasons are these, 1. The Text saith generally, *none which was uncleane in any thing,* or as the 70 have it, ἀκάθαρτος εἰς πάντα λόγον, such as were uncleane in every or any word, or (if you will) against any word, that is, against any Commandement of the Law, 2. Because impiety, profanesse, and wickednesse hath the name of uncleanesse, even in the old Testament; & such as commit sin and ungodlinesse are called unclean, and are said to defile themselves, as wel as those that were legally uncleane. I shall not neede to expound, *Lev.* 5.3. *if he touch the uncleanesse of man, whatsoever uncleanesse it be that a man shall be defiled withall;* as if it were meant of fellowship with scandalous sinners; which is *Origens* Interpretation, *Hom.* 3. *in Levit.* who also

so taketh a commentary to that Text from, 1 *Cor.*5.11. It will have more weight in it, to observe *Targum Onkelos*, *Deut.*23.2. Where the Law concerning *Mamzer* a bastard or whoores son, is thus explained, *A bastard shall not be clean that he may enter into the Congregation of the Lord: even unto the tenth Generation his sons shall not be clean that they may enter into the Congregation of the Lord.* But I will give yet surer warrants for what I say. *Iob.*36. 14. *their life is among the uncleane*, that is, (as *Pagnin* following the Chaldee paraphrase expresseth it) *inter scortatores*; *Hierome*, *inter effœminatos*: others, *inter impudicos*; the same word is rendered *Sodomites*, 1 *Kings* 14.24. It commeth from קָדַשׁ, which ἐυφήμως or *per Antiphrasin* signifieth to be impure or unclean, and it is used of the legall uncleanesse, *Deut.* 22. 9. *lest the fruit of thy Vineyard be defiled.* So *Hag.*2.13,14. both he that touched a dead body, and he that trespassed against the morall Law, is טָמֵא *uncleane*; for after the resolution concerning that which was legally uncleane, it is added, *So is this people, and so is this nation before me saith the Lord, and so is every worke of their hands, and that which they offer there is unclean.* The same name is given to an ungodly person, *Eccle.*9.2. where the godly person is called *the cleane*, the notorious scandalous prophane person is called *the unclean.* So wickednesse is frequently called *uncleannesse* as, *Ezra.* 9.11. *Ezec.*36.25. *Zech.*13.1. I wil here adde a Testimony of *Maimonides* in *More Nevochim part.*3. *cap.*47. *Hence also the transgression of the Commandement is called uncleannesse or pollution, and it is said of the principall and fundamentall Commandements, of Idolatry, of uncovering the nakednesse, of the shedding of bloud. Of Idolatry it is said*(c): Because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to defile my Sanctuary, and to prophane my holy Name. *Of the uncovering of the nakednesse*; (d) defile not your selves in any of these things. *Of the shedding of bloud*, (e) defile not therefore the Land wherein ye dwell. *Wherefore this word* uncleannesse or defilement *is said of three sorts of things, first of a mans qualities and of his transgressions of the Commandements, whether theoricall or practicall* (*that is, which concerne either Doctrine, or his conversation.*) *Secondly of externall filthinesse and defilements, &c. Thirdly, of these imaginary things, that is, the touching or carrying upon the shoulders some uncleane thing, &c.* Adde hereunto the observation

(c) Lev.20.3.
(d) Lev.18.24.
(e) Num.35. 33,34.

of Drusius de tribus sect. Iudæor. lib. 2. num. 82. 83. 84. The Pharisees did account sinners and prophane persons to be uncleane, and thought themselves polluted by the company of such persons, for which reason also they used to wash when they came from the mercate. Though there was a superstition in this Ceremony, yet the opinion that prophane persons are uncleane persons, and to be avoided for uncleanneſſe, had come from the pureſt antiquities of the Jewes, even from *Moſes* and the Prophets. Since therefore both in the old Testament phraſe, and in the usuall language of the Jewes themselves, a scandalous prophane person was called an unclean person, it is to me more then probable that where I read, *none which was uncleane in any thing should enter in*, it is meant of those that were morally uncleane by a scandalous wicked converſation, no leſſe yea much more than of those that were onely ceremonially uncleane. 3. Especially considering that the Sanctuary was prophaned and polluted by the morall uncleanneſſe of sinne, and by prophane persons their entring into it, as is manifeſt from *Lev.* 20. 3. *Eze.* 23. 39. How can it then be imagined that those Priests whose charge it was to keepe back those that were uncleane in any thing, would admit and receive such as were not onely unclean persons in the language of Scripture and of the Jewes themselves, but were also by expreſſe Scriptures declared to be defilers or polluters of the Sanctuary? 4. It is said of the high Priest, *Lev* 16. 16. *and he shall make atonement for the holy place, becauſe of the uncleanneſſe of the children of Israel, and becauſe of their transgreſſions in all their sins:* or *from* their uncleanneſſe and *from* their transgreſſions, as the Chaldee and the LXX have it: the sence is the same: and it sheweth that the holy place was made uncleane by the transgreſſions and sinnes of the children of Israel: which uncleanneſſe of transgreſſion, if it were visible, publik and notorious, then the Priests had failed in admitting such to the holy place.

12. *Object.* Throughout the old Testament we read onely of temporall punishments, as burning, hanging, stoning, fines, stripes, and the like, but never of Excommunication or any Church censure. Neither did the Jewes know the distinction of Lawes Eccleſiasticall and Lawes civill, causes Eccleſiasticall and causes

cauſes civill, for the Church of the Jewes was their Common-Wealth, and their Common-Wealth was their Church, and the Government of Church and State among them was one and the ſame. Their civill Lawyers were alſo Expoſitors or Doctors of the Law of God.

Anſ. That in the Jewiſh Church, there was an Eccleſiaſticall cenſure or puniſhment diſtinct from the civill, I have proved in this preceeding booke, both from Scripture and from the Jewiſh antiquities: And if there were no more but the ſequeſtration or ſeparation from the Temple or from the paſſeover, for ſuch legall uncleanneſſe as did not ſeparat a man from his houſe, nor from all company of men, even that alone proves a kinde of cenſure diſtinct from all civill puniſhment: neither did it belong to the Magiſtrate or civill Judge, but to the Prieſts to examine, judge, and determine concerning cleanneſſe or uncleanneſſe, and conſequently concerning admiſſion to or ſeparation from the Temple, Paſſeover, and ſacrifices.

That the Jewiſh Church and the Jewiſh State were formally diſtinct, ſee before *Chap.* 2. Where it hath beene obſerved that ſome Proſelytes had the full priviledges of the Jewiſh Church, though none of them had the full priviledges of the Jewiſh common-wealth. The like I have read of the *Spaniards*, who admit the *Moores* or inhabitants of *Moriſco* to turne Chriſtians, and receive them into Eccleſiaſticall Memberſhip and Communion, but by no meanes into their civill liberties. That the cauſes of Excommunication among them were lookt upon as ſcandalls, and not as civill injuries, ſee *Chap.* 4. This onely I adde that *More Nevochim part.* 2. *Chap.* 40. doth diſtinguiſh civill Lawes from ſacred Lawes, even among the people of God, making the ſcope of the civill Lawes to be the good ſafety and proſperity of the Common-wealth; the Sacred or Divine Lawes to concerne properly Religion and mens ſoules. He that will compare the civill Lawes and pænall Statutes of the Jewes mentioned in *Baba Kama*, with their ceremoniall Lawes concerning the holy Ordinances of God, and who ſhould have communion therein, who not, cannot but looke upon their Church and Eccleſiaſticall Lawes, as formally diſtinct from their State and civill Lawes. Again, he that will conſider who were the

viri

viri synagogæ magnæ, the men of the great synagogue, and what their power and acts were, (as Dr. *Buxtorf* describeth the same in his *Tyberias Cap.* 10, 11.) and their authoritative determinations, concerning the right writing, reading, and expounding of the holy Scripture, &c. must needs acknowledge that it was *Senatus ecclesiasticus magnus* (as *Buxtorf* cals it) and that such power and acts were incompetent to the civill Magistrate. As for their Doctors of Law and Scribes, they were of the sons of *Aaron*, yet some way diversified in their administrations. *Scaliger in elench. Trihæres. Nic. Serar. cap.* 11. distinguisheth between the νομοδιδάσκαλοι and the νομικοὶ, (*f*) that the former were the wisemen or chief of the Scribes who did interpret the Law, and declare the sence of it; the latter did attend civill forensicall matters. *Drusius de tribus sect. Iud. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13. noteth from *Luke* 11.45.46. that there was some distinction between the γραμματεῖς and the νομικοὶ, between the *Scribes* and the *Lawyers*, for when Christ had spoken of the Scribes and Pharises, *then answered one of the Lawyers and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. And he said, Wo unto you also ye Lawyers.* This will be more plaine by that other distinction observed by *Lud. de dieu.* in *Mat.* 22.35. and diverse others, between γραμματεῖς τῦ νόμυ, and γραμματεῖς τῦ λαῦ, between the Scribes of the Law of God who did interpret the Law, such as *Ezra* the Priest; and the Scribes of the people who were *Actuarii publici*, publick Notaries or Clerks. Whence it appeareth that the Offices of Scribes and Lawyers (although the persons themselves were of the Tribe of *Levi*) were so ordered, as that civill and sacred affaires might not be confounded. Yea, the Scriveners or Notaries were of two sorts; for besides those which did attend civill Courts of Justice, &c. There was a chiefe Scribe who waited upon the King and wrote unto him a coppy of the Book of the Law, according to that *Deut.* 17.18. Such a Scribe was *Sheva*, 2 *Sam.* 20.25. *Shaphan* 2 *Kings* 22.3.8. *Baruch Ier.* 36. Such a Scribe had Joash 2 *Kings* 12.10. There were divers other Scribes for the house of the Lord and for the people, whose office it was to write and to read the Law, 1 *Chro.* 2.55, *Psal.* 45.1. *Ier.* 8.8.

(*f*) Quum νομοδιδάσκαλοι legem interpretarentur, quod proprium τῶν σοφῶν, νομικοὶ verò formulas juris præscriberent, & actiones civiles docerent, & forensia magis tractarent.

13. *Object.* But neither in the old Testament nor in the Talmudists can there be found any Ecclesiasticall Excommunication properly so called.

Answ.

Answ. I deny both, yea I have disproved both. Moreover, as touching the Excommunication used in the Jewish Church I shall adde here these following Testimonies of *Maimonides*. *In libro* סדר *Tract. Talmud Torah Cap.* 6. *sect.* 10. *He that revileth a wiseman, though after his death, shall be excommunicated by the Sanhedrin, by whom also after repentance he shall be absolved. Ib. sect.* 11. *He who is excommunicated in his own Town, ought also to be esteemed in all other Cities and Towns, as a person excommunicated.* Answerable hereunto were the ancient Canons, which did appoint that a person excommunicated in his own Church should not be received to communion in another Church. The 24. causes of excommunication (above mentioned) he there reckoneth forth from *sect.* 13. to the end of that Chapter. Again, *Cap.* 7. *sect.* 2. *What is the manner of a simple excommunication or Niddui? He that doth excommunicate saith: Let that person N. be in* (or *under*) *an excommunication or separation. If the person excommunicated be present, they who doe excommunicate say unto him, Let this person N. be separated or excommunicated. And when Cherem or the greater excommunication is inflicted, what is the manner? They say, Let N. be devoted and accursed, let an execration, adjuration and separation be upon him. But how doe they loose the person excommunicated, and how doe they free him from the separation or the curse? they say, Be thou loosed, be thou pardoned. If the guilty party be absent, they say, Let N. be loosed, and let him be pardoned.* In the same Chapter sect. 8. *Neither is there any certain space of time predetermined, before which the bond of the excommunication inflicted may not be loosed. For immediately and at the same time when excommunication is inflicted, it may be loosed if the guilty party doe immediately repent, and come to himselfe.* Which doth further set forth the great difference between the nature and scope of Excommunication, and the nature and scope of corporall or civill punishments. For how soon soever an excommunicat person giveth good signes of true repentance, he is to be loosed from the bond of excommunication. But he that is punished in his body or estate for any crime, is not freed from the punishment, because he is known to be penitent; The repentance of a criminall person is no *supersedeas* to civill Justice. Thereafter *Maimonides* proceedeth thus. *Yet if it seem good to the Sanhedrin that any man shall be left in the state of excommunication*

munication, for how many yeeres shall be be left in excommunication? The Sanhedrin will determine the number of yeers and space of time, according to the haynousnesse of the trespasse. So likewise if the Sanhedrin will, it may devote and subject to a curse, first the party himself who is guilty of the crime, and then also every other person whosoever eateth or drinketh with him, or sitteth neere unto him unlesse at foure cubits distance: that so by this means the heavier correction may fall upon the sinner, and there may be as it were a hedge put about the law, which may restrain wicked men from transgressing it. Whence observe 1. It was from the Jewish Church, that the ancient Councels of the Christian Church, took a pattern for determining and fixing a certaine number of yeeres to the separation of some haynous offenders from the Sacrament, and sometimes from other Ordinances also. Though I doe not approve this thing, either in the Jewish or Christian Church; for at what time soever a scandalous sinner doth give evident signes of repentance, the Church ought to receive him againe into her bosome and fellowship. 2. From the Jewish Church also was the patterne taken, for that ancient Discipline in the Christian Church, that he who keepeth company and communion with an excommunicated person, should fall under the same censure of excommunication. Which thing must be well explained and qualified before it can be approved. 3. Compare also this passage of *Maimonides* with 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *with such a one no not to eate*, 2 Thes. 3. 14. *have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.* Which Texts doe fitly answer to that which the Hebrew writers say of a person excommunicated. 4. The excommunication of an offender among the Jewes, was intended not onely for the offenders humiliation and amendment, but for an ensample to others, that they might heare and feare and do no more any such thing: it was therefore a publique and exemplary censure. And so much of *Sect.* 8.

In the 9. and 10. Sections *Maimonides* sheweth us, that though a wise man was allowed to prosecute unto the sentence of excommunication one that did revile or calumniat him, yet it was more praise-worthy and more agreeable to the example of the holy men of God to passe in silence and to endure patiently such injuries. Then followeth *Sect.* 11. *These things which have been said, are to be understood of such reproaches and contumelies as are clandestine*

clandestine. For if railers doe put a publike infamy upon a wise man, it is not lawfull to him to use indulgence or to neglect his honour: and if he shall pardon (as to the punishment) *him who hath hurt his fame, he himselfe is to be punished, because that is a contempt of the law. He shall therefore avenge the contumely, & not suffer himselfe to be satisfied, before the guilty party hath craved mercy.* Here is the true object, or (if you will) the procuring and meritorious cause of Excommunication, *viz.* not a private personall or civill injury, which a man may passe by or pardon if he will, but a scandalous sinne the scandall whereof must be removed and healed, by some Testimony or Declaration of the sinners repentance, otherwise he must fall under the censure and publique shame.

These Testimonies of *Maimonides*, and the observations made thereupon, beside all that hath been said in this preceding Book, will make it manifest that the Spirituall censure of excommunication was translated and taken from the Jewish Church into the Christian Church.

Furthermore, beside all the Scriptural proofs already brought, I shall desire another Text, *Nehem.* 13.1,3. to be wel weighed. After the reading of the law (*Deut.* 23.3.) that the *Ammonite* and the *Moabite* should not come into the congregation of God for ever, *it came to passe*, saith the Text, *when they heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.* I conceive that this separation was a casting out of the Church of *Israel*, and is not meant here of a civill separation from honours and priviledges, nor yet onely in reference to the dissolution of unlawfull marriages. I understand also by the prohibition of entring into the congregation of the Lord *Deut.* 23.1,2,3. that such were not to be received into Church communion. *Ostendit autem qui a cœtibus fidelium debeant excludi. He sheweth who ought to be excluded from the assemblies of the faithfull*, saith *Aretius* upon *Deut.* 23. 1. *Hic dicitur Ecclesia Dei atrium mundorum, quod non debebant tales ingredi. Here that Court of the Temple which was appointed only for the clean, is called the Congregation of God, whereunto such persons ought not to enter* saith *Hugo Cardinalis* upon the same place. *Audita lege de duabus inimicis gentibus anathematizandis, &c. Having heard the law concerning the two hostile Nations, to be anathematized or accursed*, saith *Beda* on *Nehem.* 13. thereupon they separated the

mixed multitude. *Pelargus* on *Deut.* 23. citeth *Theodoret*, *Procopius*, and *Rabanus*, besides the Canonists, for this sence, that the not entring into the Congregation of the Lord, is meant of refusing Ecclesiasticall not civill priviledges. I know that divers others understand *Deut.* 23. 1,2,3. of not admitting unto, and *Nehem.* 13.3. of separating from marriages with the Jewes, and civill dignities or places of Magistrates or Rulers in that Commonwealth, such a one *shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord*, that is, shall not be received into the Assembly or Court of Judges. But there are some reasons which diswade me from this and incline me to the other interpretation.

First, the Law *Deut.* 23. being read to the people *Nehem.* 13.3. upon the hearing of that law *they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude*. It is not to be imagined that all this mixed multitude was married to Jewes, muchlesse that they were all Magistrats, Rulers, or members of Courts and Judicatures in *Israel*. But by *the mixed multitude* are meant all such as were in *Israel* but not of *Israel*, or such as conversed and dwelt among the Jewes and had civill fellowship with them, but had no part nor portion (by right) in Church-membership and Communion: in which sence also *the mixed multitude* is mentioned *Exod.* 12. 38. *Num.* 11.4.

Secondly, that this separation from Israel is to be understood in a spirituall and ecclesiasticall sence, it appeareth by the instance and application immediately added *Neh.* 13.4. to vers. 10. *And before this*, that is, before this separation, *Eliashib* the Priest being allied unto *Tobiah* had prepared for him a chamber in the Courts of the house of God, but now when the separation of the mixed multitude was made; *Nehemiah* did cast out the stuffe of *Tobiah*, and commanded to cleanse the chambers of the Temple which had been defiled by *Tobiah*. Behold an instance of the separation in reference to the Temple or holy place, not to any civill Court.

Thirdly, the Chaldee paraphrase helpeth me *Deut.* 23. 1,2,3. for instead of these words, *shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord*, *Onkelos* readeth *shall not be clean to enter into the congregation of the Lord*; having respect to the law which did forbid uncleane persons to enter into the Temple. *Itaisti mundi reputabantur:*

tabantur: so likewise were these (*Ammonites, Moabites*, bastards, &c.) *esteemed as unclean*, saith *Tostatus in Deut.* 23. *quæst.* 1.

Fourthly, *Edomites* and *Egytians* might enter into the congregegration of the Lord in the third generation *Deut.* 22. 7, 8. Was the meaning, that *Edomites* and *Egyptians* should in the third generation marry with the Jewes, or be Magistrates in *Israel*, members of the Sanhedrin, or Judges? He that will thinke so, will hardly prove that it was so. To me it is not at all probable, that God would allow his people either to marry with the *Edomites* and *Egyptians*, or to prefer them to be Magistrates and Judges in *Israel*, no not in the third generation. But it is very probable, that when an *Edomite* or *Egyptian* came to dwell in the Land of *Israel*, as a proselyte indweller, observing the seven precepts given to the sonnes of *Noah*, the children of that *Egyptian* or *Edomite* in the third generation, might enter into the congregation of the Lord, that is, might upon their desire and submission to the whole law of *Moses*, be received as proselytes of righteousnesse or of the Covenant, and so free to come to the Court of *Israel*, and in all Church relations to be as one of the Israelites themselves.

Fifthly, *Philo* the Jew *lib. de victimas offerentibus* towards the end, tels us that their Law did prohibit all unworthy persons from their sacred Assemblies, σφυρίζει πάντας τοὺς ἀναξίους ἱερᾶς συλλόγου. From the same sacred Assemblies of the Church, he saith that their law did also exclude Eunuchs, and bastards, or such as were borne ἐκ πόρνης (the word used by the LXX in *Deut.* 23. 2.) where *Philo* most certainly hath respect to that Law, *Deut.* 23. understanding by *the congregation of the Lord* in that place, neither a civill Court nor liberty of marriage, but the sacred or Church Assembly.

There are but two objections which I finde brought against that which I have been now proving. One is from *Exod.* 12. 48. a law which admitteth strangers to the Church and Passeover of the Jewes, provided they were willing to be circumcised. The other objection is from the example of *Ruth* the *Moabitesse*, who was a member of the Church of *Israel*.

To the first I answer, that *Exod.* 12. 48. will not prove that every

every ſtranger who deſired to be circumciſed, and to eate the Paſſeover, was to be immediately admitted upon that deſire, without any more adoe: onely it proves that before any ſtranger ſhould eate of the Paſſeover, he muſt firſt be circumciſed. A ſtranger might not be *Ger tſedek*, a proſelyte of righteouſneſſe, when he pleaſed, but he was firſt to be ſo and ſo qualified. Beſides this, it may be juſtly doubted whether *Deut.*23.3.be not an exception from the rule *Exod.*12.48. for all ſtrangers were not to be alike ſoon and readily received to be proſelytes of righteouſneſſe: but a great difference there was betweeen thoſe Nations which God had expreſſely and particularly devoted and accurſed,and others not ſo accurſed.

To the other objection concerning *Ruth*, *Rabanus* cited by *Pelargus* on *Deut.*23. anſwereth that the tenth generation of the *Moabites* was paſt, before *Ruth* did enter into the congregation of the Lord. And if it had not, yet the caſe was extraordinary, and one Swallow makes not Summer.

14. *Object.* But is there any patterne or preſident in the Jewiſh Church, for keeping backe ſcandalous ſinners from the Sacrament?

Anſ. There is; for I have proved a keeping back of notorious ſinners both from the Paſſeover, and from the Temple it ſelfe which had a Sacramentall ſignification and was a Type of Chriſt and Communion with him. It is worthy of obſervation that by the Chaldee paraphraſe, *Exod.*12.43. Any Iſraelite who was אֲשׁתַּמַּד *an apoſtate*, might not eate of the Paſſeover. Againe, verſe 48. וְכָל חִילוֹנָיו *& omnis prophanus.* So the Latine Interpreter of *Onkelos: And no prophane perſon ſhall eate of it.* The word is uſed not onely of a Heathen, but of any prophane perſon, as *Prov.*2.16. where the Chaldee expreſſeth the whoriſh woman (though a Jeweſſe) by the name of חִילוֹנִיתָא. It commeth from חָלַל to be prophaned,è *ſancto prophanum fieri.* Surely *Onkelos* had not thus paraphraſed upon *Exod.* 12. if it had not been the Law of the Jewes, that notorious prophane perſons ſhould be kept backe from the Paſſeover.

The

The second Book OF THE CHRISTIAN Church-Goverment.

CHAP. I.

Of the Riſe, Growth, Decay, and Reviving of Eraſtianiſme.

DIverſe Learned men have (to very good purpoſe) diſcovered the origination, occaſion, firſt authors, fomenters, riſe and growth of Errors, both Popiſh, and others: I ſhall after their example make known briefly, what I find concerning the riſe and growth, the planting and watering of the *Eraſtian* Error. I cannot ſay of it, that it is *honeſtis parentibus natus*, it is not borne and deſcended of honeſt parents. The *Father* of it is the old

Serpent, who finding his Kingdom very much impaired, weakned and resisted by the vigor of the true Ecclesiastical discipline, which separateth *between the precious and the vile, the holy & prophane*; and so contributeth much to the shaming away of the unfruitful works of darknesse; thereupon he hath cunningly gone about to draw men, first into a jealousie, and then into a dislike of the Ecclesiastical discipline, by Gods mercy restored in the Reformed Churches. The *Mother* of it, is the enmity of nature against the Kingdom of *Jesus Christ*; which he, as Mediator, doth exercise in the goverment of the Church: Which enmity is naturally in all mens hearts, but is unmortified and strongly prevalent in some, who have said in their hearts, *We will not have this man to raigne over us*. Luke 19. *Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us*. Psal. 2. 3. The *Midwife* which brought this unhappy brood into the light of the world, was *Thomas Erastus* Doctor of Medicine at *Heidelberg* of whom I shall say no more, then what is apparant by his owne Preface to the Reader, namely, that as he was once of opinion, that excomunication is commanded in the Word of God, so he came off to the contrary opinion, not without a male-contented humour, and a resentment of some things which he lookt upon as provocations and personal reflections, though its like enough they were not really such, but in his apprehensions they were. One of these was a publick dispute at *Heydelberg* in the year 1568. upon certain *Theses* concerning the necessity of Church Government, and the power of Presbyteries to excommunicate: Which *Theses* were exhibited by M. *George Withers* an *Englishman*, who left *England* because of the Ceremonies, and was at that time made Doctor of Divinity at *Heydelberg*. And the learned dispute had thereupon, you may find epitomized (as it was taken the day following from the mouth of *Dr. Vrsinus*) in the close of the second part of *Dr. Pareus* his explication of the *Heidelberg* Catechisme.

The *Erastian* error being borne, the *breasts* which gave it suck were *prophanesse* and *self-interest*. The sons of *Belial* were very much for it, expecting that the eye of the civil Magistrate shall not be so vigilant over them, nor his hand so much against them for a scandalous and dissolute conversation, as

Church

Church-discipline would be. *Germanorum bibere est vivere*, in *practice* as well as in *pronunciation*. What great marvel if many among them (for I do not speak of all) did comply with the *Erastian* Tenent? And it is as little to be marvelled at, if those, whether Magistrates, Lawyers, or others, who conceived themselves to be so far losers, as Ecclesiastical Courts were interested in Government, and to be greater gainers by the abolition of the Ecclesiastical interest in government; were byassed that way: Both these you may find among the causes (mentioned by *Aretius Theol. probl. loc.* 133.) for which there was so much unwillingnes to admit the discipline of Excomunication. *Magistratus jugum non admittunt, timent honoribus, licentiam amant, &c. The Magistrates do not admit a yoke, are jealous of their honours, love licentiousnesse. Vulgus quoque & plebs dissolutior: major pars corruptissima est, &c. The Communaltie also and people are more dissolute: the greater part is most vicious.*

After that this unlucky child had been nursed upon so bad milk, it came at last to eat *strong food*, and that was Arbitrary Government, under the name of Royall Prerogative. Mr. *John Wemys* (sometime Senator of the Colledge of Justice in *Scotland*) as great a Royalist as any of his time, in his book *de Regis primatu, lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. doth utterly dissent from and argue against the distinction of Civil and Ecclesiasticall lawes, and against the Synodical power of censures; holding that both the power of making Ecclesiastical lawes, and the corrective power to censure Transgressors, is proper to the Magistrate.

The *Tutor* which bred up the Erastian error, was *Arminianisme*; for the Arminians finding their plants pluckt up, and their poison antidoted by Classes and Synods, thereupon they began to cry down Synodical authority, and to appeal to the Magistrates power in things Ecclesiastical, hoping for more favour and lesse opposition that way. They will have Synods only to examine, dispute, discusse, to impose nothing under pain of Ecclesiastical censure, but to leave all men free, to do as they list. See their *exam. cens. cap.* 25. and *Vindic. lib.* 2. *cap.* 6. *pag.* 131.133. And for the Magistrate they have endeavoured to make him head of the Church, as the Pope was; yea so far, that they are not ashamed to ascribe unto the Magistrate that Jurisdiction

over the Churches, Synods, and Ecclesiastical proceedings' which the Pope did formerly usurpe: For which see *Apollonius* in his *Jus Majestatis circa sacra.*

But the *Erastian* Error being thus borne, nursed, fed, and educated, did fall into a most deadly decay and consumption: the procuring causes whereof were these three. First, the best and most (and in some respect all) of the Reformed Churches refused to receive, harbour, or entertain it, and so left it exposed to hunger and cold, shame and nakednesse.

Some harbour it had in *Switzerland*, but that was lookt upon as comming onely through injury of time, which could not be helped; the Theological and Scriptural principles of the Divines of those Churches, being *Anti-Erastian*, and Presbyteriall, as I have* elsewhere shewed against Mr. *Coleman*. So that *Erastianisme* could not get warmth and strength enough, no not in *Zurick* it self. Yea Dr. *Ursinus* in his *Iudicium de Disciplinâ Ecclesiasticâ, & excommunicatione*, exhibited to the Prince *Elector Palatine Frederick* the third (who had required him to give his judgement concerning *Erastus* his *Theses*) doth (a) once and again observe, that all the Reformed Churches and Divines, as well those that did not practice excommunication, as those that did practise it, agree notwithstanding in this principle, that excommunication ought to be in the Church. Which is a mighty advantage against *Erastianisme.*

* See *Nihil Respondes* pag. 32. 33. *Male audis* pag. 52. 53.

(a) *In alijs (Ecclesijs) ubi aut nulla est excommunicatio in usu, aut non legitime administratur, ac nihilominus absque omni controversia, in confesso est ac palam docetur, eam merito in Ecclesia vigere debere.* Et infra, *Ne etiam Celsitudo tua se suasque Ecclesias ab alijs omnibus Ecclesijs, tam ab ijs quæ nullam habent Excommunicationem, quam ab ijs quæ habent, nova hac opinione sejungat: siquidem universæ ac singulæ uno ore confitentur, semperque confessæ sunt, merito illam in usu esse debere.* (b) Erast. præfat. *Nos de illis solis loqui peccatoribus qui doctrinam intelligunt, probant amplectuntur: peccata sua se agnoscere vere atque odisse aiunt, & Sacramentis secundum Institutionem Christi uti cupiunt.* Et lib. 6. cap. 2. *faciunt præterea nobis injuriam (imo vera calumnia est) cum dicunt nos omnes sine ullo examine velle admitti, quales quales sint ac esse velint. Quippe sic volumus unumquemque admitti, quomodo Ecclesiæ nostræ consuetudo & regula jubet.* Et infra. *Sane ut Idololatram & Apostatam, negamus membrum esse Ecclesiæ Christi, sic etiam Nequitiam suam desendentem negamus inter membra Ecclesiæ censendum esse. Et quemadmodum illos ex Christiano cœtu judicamus exterminandos, sic hos quoque putamus in eo cœtu non esse ferendos. Verum neque de his, neque de illis quærunt nostræ Theses: sed disputatur in eis de solis doctrinam amplexantibus, & Sacramentis rite cum Ecclesia uti cupientibus, hoc est pœnitentiam eodem modo quo alij profitentibus.*

The second cause was a mis-accident from the Mid-wife, who did half stifle it in the birth, from which did accrue a most dangerous infirmity, of which it could never recover. (b) Read the preface of *Erastus* before the Confirmation of his *Theses*

Theses; also the close of his sixth Book; put these together, you will find him yeeld, that all ought not to be admitted promiscuously to the Sacrament, but that such admission be according to the custome and rule observed in the Church of *Heidelberg* (and what that was, you may find in the *Heidelberg* Catechisme *Quæst.* 82. & 87. namely a suspension of prophane scandalous persons from the Sacrament, and in case of their obstinacy and continuing in their offences, an excommunicating of them.) He yeelds also that these seven sorts of persons ought not to be esteemed as members of the Church, and that if any such be found in the visible Church, they ought to be cast out. 1. Idolaters. 2. Apostates. 3. Such as do not understand the true Doctrine, that is, Ignorant Persons. 4. Such as doe not approve and embrace the true Doctrine, that is, Hereticks and Sectaries. 5. Such as desire to receive the Sacrament otherwise then in the right manner, and according to Christs Institution. 6. Such as defend or justifie their wickednes. 7. Such as doe not confesse and acknowledge their sins, and professe sorrow and repentance for them, and a hatred or detestation of them. And thus you see as *Erastianisme* pleadeth for no favour to Sectaries, or whosoever dissent in doctrine, or whose Tenents concerning Christs Institution, or manner of Administration, are contrary to that which is received in the Church where they live: (for (c) it is content that all such, were they never so peaceable and godly, be cast out of the Church by excommunication. All the favour and forbearance which it pleadeth for, is to the loose and prophane) So neither doth it altogether exempt the prophane, but such onely as do neither deny nor defend their wickednesse, but confesse their sins, and professe sorrow for them. Let the Erastians of this time observe what their great Master hath yeelded touching the Ecclesiastical Censure of prophane ones. Which though it is not satisfactory to us, for reasons elsewhere given, yet it can be as little satisfactory to them. But whereas *Erastus* together with those his Concessions (that hee may seem to have said somewhat) falls a quarrelling with Presbyteries for presuming to judge of the sincerity of that repentance

(c) Erastus ib. *Equidem in Thesibus ab initio monui, me de sola illa excommunicatione agere, qua aliqui doctrinam intelligentes, probantes, amplexantes, & Sacramentis rectè uti cupientes, quod ad externum usum attinet ab eijsdem propter anteactæ vitæ turpitudinem a quibusdam Presbyteris repelluntur: quia scilicet non videtur eis serio dolere, qui lapsus fuit, ac sibi dolere id profitetur.*

tance professed by a scandalous sinner, and their not resting satisfied with a mans owne profession of his repentance. If his followers will now be pleased to reduce the controversie within that narrow circle, Whether a Presbyterie may excommunicate from the Church, or at least suspend from the Sacrament, any Church-member, as an impenitent scandalous sinner, who yet doth not defend nor denie his sin by which he hath given scandall, but confesseth it, and professeth sincere and hearty repentance for it: (which is the point that *Erastus* is faine to hold at in the issue) Then I hope we shall be quickly agreed, and the controversie buried; for we do rest satisfied with the offender his confession of his sinne, and profession of his repentance, unlesse his owne known words or actions give the lye to his profession of repentance; that is, if he be known to justifie and defend his sin in his ordinary discourse, or to continue in the practice of the sin, which he professeth to the Presbyterie he repents of; if these or such like sure signes of his impenitency be known, must the Presbyterie notwithstanding rest satisfied with his verbal profession of repentance? All that fear God (I think) would cry shame, shame, upon such an assertion. And moreover, let us take it in the case of an Idolater, Heretick, Apostate (for *Erastus* is content that such be excluded from the Sacrament.) Suppose such a one doth confesse his sin, and professeth repentance, in the mean while is known to be a writer or spreader of books in defence of that Idolatry or Heresie, or to be a perswader and enticer of others secretly to that way, or if there be any other known infallible signe of his impenitency, must his verbal profession to the Presbyterie in such cases be trusted and taken as satisfactory? I am confident *Erastus* himself would not have said so. Wherefore as in the case of an Heretick, so in the case of a prophane person, or one of a scandalous conversation, there is a necessity that the Presbyterie examine the real signes of repentance, and the offenders verbal profession is not all.

The third cause which helped forward the deadly malady and consumption of Erastianisme; was the grief, shame, confusion and losse which it sustained by the learning and labour of some Divines in the Reformed Churches, who had to very good pur-

pose

poſe taken pains to diſcover to the world the curſed nature of that unlucky brood, being of the ſeed of the *Amalekites*, which ought not to enter into the Congregation of the Lord. The Divines who have more eſpecially and particularly appeared againſt it, are (to my obſervation) theſe. *Beza de Excommunicatione, & Presbyterio contra Eraſtum :* Which was not printed till *Eraſtus* his Reply unto it was firſt printed. Whereunto as *Beza* in a large Preface layeth the foundation of a duply, ſo he had prepared and perfected his duply, had he not been hindred by the great troubles of *Geneva*, at that time beſieged by the Duke of *Savoy*; *Beza* himſelf being alſo at that time 71. yeares old: howbeit for all this, he did not lay aſide the reſolution and thought of that duply, if he ſhould have opportunity, and ſee it requiſite or calld for; all which is manifeſt from that preface. Next to him, I reckon *Zacharias Urſinus* a moſt ſolid judicious Divine, who did (as I touched before) exhibite to the Prince *Elector Palatine Frederick* the third, *Iudicium de diſciplina Eccleſiaſtica & Excommunicatione* (which you may find in the end of his third Tome) wherein he doth ſoundly confute the *Theſes* of *Eraſtus*, neither hath any reply been made thereto, that ever I could learn of: Alſo in his Catecheticall explications, *Quæſt*, 85. He plainly diſputes againſt the Eraſtian principles. The more ſtrange it is that Mr. *Huſſey* in his Epiſtle to the Parliament would make them beleeve that *Urſinus* is his, and not ours, in this controverſie.

After theſe, there did others, more lately, come upon the Stage againſt the *Eraſtian* Principles, as *Caſparus Brochmand* a Lutheran, in *Syſtem. Theol. Tom. 2. Artic. De diſciplina Eccleſiaſtica*, where he examineth the moſt ſubſtantiall Arguments of *Eraſtus*: *Antonius Walæus de munere miniſtrorum Eccleſiæ & inſpectione Magiſtratus circa illud. Et in locis com. de clavibus & poteſtate Eccleſiaſtica. Et Tom. 2. Diſp. de diſciplina Eccleſiaſtica. Helmichius de vocatione Paſtorum & inſtitutione Conſiſtoriorum. D. Triglandius in diſſertatione de poteſtate civili & Eccleſiaſtica. D. Revius in examine libelli de Epiſcopatu Conſtantini magni. D. Apollonij Jus Majeſtatis circa ſacra. D. Cabeliavius de libertate Eccleſiæ in exercenda diſciplina ſpirituali. Dr. Voetius* in his *Politica Eccleſiaſtica*, eſpeci-

eſpecially his Diſputations *de poteſtate & Politia Eccleſiarum.* Beſide *Acronius, Thyſius, Ludov. a Reneſſe*, who were Champions againſt that unhappy error revived in the Low-Countries by *Wtenbogard* a Proſelyte of the Arminians.

But now, while *Eraſtianiſme* did thus lye a dying, and like to breath its laſt, is there no Phyſitian who will undertake the cure, and endeavour to raiſe it up from the gates of death to life? Yes, Mr. *Coleman* was the man, who (to that purpoſe) firſt appeared publikely; Firſt by a Sermon to the Parliament; Next, by debating the Controverſie with my ſelfe in writing; and laſtly, By engaging in a publike debate in the Reverend Aſſembly of Divines, againſt this Propoſition: *Jeſus Chriſt as King and Head of His Church, hath appointed a Government in the Church, in the hands of Church-Officers, diſtinct from the Civil Government.* After he had ſome dayes argued againſt this propoſition (having full liberty both to argue and reply as much as he pleaſed) it pleaſed God to viſit him with ſickneſſe, during which, the Aſſembly (upon intimation from himſelf, that he wiſhed them to lay aſide that Propoſition for a time, that if God ſhould give him health again, he might proceed in his debate) did goe upon other matter, and lay this aſide for that ſeaſon. The Lord was pleaſed to remove him by death, before he could do what he intended in this, and other particulars. One of his intentions was to tranſlate and publiſh in Engliſh the Book of *Eraſtus* againſt Excommunication. But through Gods mercy, before the poiſon was ready, there was one Antidote ready, I mean Mr. *Rutherford* his anſwer to *Eraſtus.* But though Mr. *Coleman* was the firſt man, he was not the onely man that hath appeared in this preſent Controverſie in *England.* Others (and thoſe of divers profeſſions) are come upon the Stage. I ſhall leave every man to his Judge, and ſhall judge nothing before the time. Onely I ſhall wiſh every man to conſider ſadly and ſeriouſly, by what Spirit and Principles he is led, and whether he be ſeeking the things of *Chriſt*, or his owne things; whether he be pleaſing men, or pleaſing *Chriſt*; whether ſin be more ſhamed, and holineſſe more advanced, this way, or that way; Which way is moſt agreeable to the Word of God, to the example of the beſt Reformed Churches

Churches; and so to the solemne League and Covenant. The Controversie is now hot: every faithfull servant of Christ, will be carefull to deliver his owne soule by his faithfulnesse, and let the Lord do what seemeth him good. The cause is not ours, but *Christs*; it stands him upon his Honour, his Crowne, his Lawes, his Kingdom. Our eyes are towards the Lord, and we will wait for a divine decision of the businesse: *For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, The Lord is our King, he will save us.* Isa. 33. 22.

CHAP. II.

Some Postulata *or common Principles to be presupposed.*

FOr a foundation to the following discourse, I shall premise the particulars following, which I hope shall be condescended upon, and acknowledged, as so many κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι.

1. There must be a most conscientious and speciall care had, that there be not a promiscuous admission of all sorts of persons (that please or desire) to partake in all the publike Ordinances of God: but a distinction is to be made of the precious and the vile, the clean and the unclean; I mean those who are apparantly and visibly such. This was a principle and rule among the Heathens themselves, therefore (d) when they came to doe sacrifice, the prophane were bidden be gone, and

(d) *Procul, hinc procul ite prophani,*
Conclamat vates, totoque abstinite luco.
Et illud, ἔκτὸς ἔκτὸς ὅσις ἀλιτῆρος
Et illud, *Tu Genitor cape sacra manu patriosque penates.*
Me bello exanto digressum & cæde recenti
Attrectare nefas, donec me flumine vivo
Abluero——

(e) Cæsar lib. 6. de bello Gallico, *Si quis privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non steterit, sacrificijs interdicunt. Hæc pœna est apud eos gravissima. Quibus est interdictum, ij numero impiorum ac sceleratorum habentur. Ij omnes decedunt* (others read) *ab ijs omnes decedunt*) *aditum sermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant.*

(e) *Cæsar* tells us, that of old the *Druides* (the Heathnish French Priests) did interdict the flagitious from their sacrifices and holy things.

These *Druides France* had from *England*, if the observation of *Francis Holy-Oke* out of *Tacitus*, hold.

2. That censures and punishments ought to be appointed and inflicted, as for personal and private injuries between man and man, so much more for publike and scandalous sins, wherby God is very much dishonoured, and the Church dangerously scandalized. *Tyberius* his slighting maxime, *Deorum injurias Dijs curæ esse*, may be entertained among Atheists, but is exploded among all true Christians. Πρῶτον γὰρ ἡ περὶ θεὸν ἐπιμέλεια, is the Christian maxime. Care is to be first taken of things pertaining to God.

3. It is requisite and necessary, that he who hath given publick scandall and offence to the Church, and hath openly dishonoured God by a grosse notorious sin, should honour God, edifie others, and (so far as in him lyeth) remove the offence by a publike confession of the sin, and declaration of his sorrow and repentance for the same; and of his resolution (through the grace of *Christ*) to do so no more: As many of the Beleevers at *Ephesus* did publikely confesse and shew their deeds: *Act.* 19. 18. The *Syriack* addeth *their offences*. A patterne of this confession we have in the Law of *Moses*, and Jewish policie (whereof else-where) as likewise in the Baptisme of *John*, Matth. 3. 6.

Of this publike Confession of sin, see *Festus Hommius disp.* 51. *Thes.* 2. Mr. *Hildersham* on *Psal.* 51. *Lect.* 34. & 37. and diverse others. Both the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches, leadeth us this way. The Centurists *Cent.* 1. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 4. observe four kinds of confession in the New-Testament: First, a Confession of sin to God alone. 1 *John* 1. 9. Secondly, a confession *coram Ecclesia*, before the Church, when men acknowledge publikely their wicked and scandalous deeds, and do professe their repenting and lothing of the same: And for this they cite *Act.* 19. 18. Thirdly, a confession one to another of particular private injuries and offences, chiefly recommended to those who are at variance, and have

have wronged one another. *Jam.* 5. 16. Fourthly, the confession or profession of the true Faith. 1 *John* 4. 2.

4. That publick shame put upon a scandalous sinner, and the separating or casting out of such an one, as the vile from the precious, is the fittest and most effectual means which the Church can use to humble him, to break his heart, and to bring him to the acknowledgement of his offence.

5. That there may be and often are such persons in the Church, whom (f) we must avoid, *Rom.* 16. 17. *Withdraw from them.* 1 *Tim* 6. 5. 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. 2 *Thes.* 3. 6. *Have no company with them.* 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. *Not eat with them.* 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *Nor bid them God speed.* 2 *Epist. John, vers.* 10. 11.

(f) Eraſtus lib. 4. cap. 7. *Horum debetis vitam & mores observare, & quos impuros esse cognovistis vitare, ne vos quoque inficiamini; ipsi autem judefiant & in viam redeant.*

6. That since there must be a withdrawing from a brother that walketh disorderly and scandalously, its more agreeable to the glory of God, and to the Churches peace, that this be done by a publick authoritative Ecclesiastical judgement and sentence, than wholly and solely to trust it to the piety and prudence of each particular Christian, to esteem as heathens and publicans, whom, and when, and for what he shall think good, and accordingly to withdraw and separate from them.

7. That there is a distinction between Magistracy and Ministery, even *Jure Divino.* That the civil Magistrate hath not power to abolish or continue the Ministery *in abstracto* at his pleasure; nor yet to make or unmake Ministers *in concreto*, that is, to ordain or depose Ministers, as he thinks fit.

8. As the Offices are distinct (g) so is the power; Magistrates may do what Ministers may not doe: and Ministers may doe what Magistrates may not do.

(g) Salmasius appar. ad lib. de prim. pag. 303. *Cum sit ut jam vidimus duplex potestas Ecclesiastica, altera interna, externa altera, tam peccant qui utramque principi, vel magistratui civili tribuunt, quam qui utramque denegant ministro Ecclesiastico.*

9. It is *Juris Communis*, a principle of common equity and naturall reason, that the directive Judgement in any matter doth chiefly belong to such as (by their profession and vocation) are devoted and set apart to the study and knowledge of such matters, and (in that respect) supposed to be ablest and fittest to give Judgement thereof. A consultation of Physitians is called for, when the Magistrate desires to know the nature, symptomes, or cure of some dangerous disease. A consultation of Lawyers, in Legal questions. A Councell of War in military expeditions. If the Magistrate be in a ship at Sea, he

he takes not on him the directive part of Navigation, which belongs to the master, with the mates and pilot. Neither doth the master of the ship (if it come to a Sea-fight) take on him the directive part in the fighting, which belongs to the Captain. And so in all other cases, *Artifici in sua arte credendum.* Wherefore though the Judgement of Christian prudence and discretion belongs to every Christian, and to the Magistrate in his Station; and though the Magistrate may be, and sometime is learned in the Scriptures, and well acquainted with the principles of true Divinity, yet *ut plurimum*, and ordinarily, especially in a rightly Reformed and well constituted Church, Ministers are to be supposed to be fittest and ablest to give a directive Judgement in things and causes Spiritual and Ecclesiastical: with whom also other ruling Church-Officers do assist and joyne, who are more experimentally and practically (they ought also, and diverse times are more Theoretically) acquainted with the right way and rules of Church-government and censures; then the civil Magistrate (when he is no ruling Elder in the Church, which is but accidentall) can be rationally or ordinarily supposed to be.

10. There is some power of Governement, in the Church given to the Ministery by *Christ*: else why are they said to be set over us in the Lord, and called Rulers and Governours, as we shall see afterwards?

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

What the Eraſtians *yeeld unto Vs, and what We yeeld unto them.*

FOr better ſtating of the controverſie, We ſhall firſt of all take notice of ſuch particulars as are the Oppoſites conceſſions to us, or our conceſſions to them. Their conceſſions are theſe.

1. ([h]) That the Chriſtian Magiſtrate in ordering and diſpoſing of Eccleſiaſtical cauſes and matters of Religion, is tyed to keep cloſe to the Rule of the Word of God; and that as he may not aſſume an Arbitrary Government of the State, ſo far leſſe of the Church.

2. That Church-Officers may exerciſe Church-government, and authority in matters of Religion, where the Magiſtrate doth not profeſſe and defend the true Religion: In ſuch a caſe two Governments are allowed to ſtand together, one civil, another Eccleſiaſtical. This ([i]) *Eraſtus* granteth, as it were by conſtraint, and it ſeems by way of compliance with the Divines of *Zurik* (who hold excommunication by Church-Officers under an infidel Magiſtrate, and that *jure Divino*) to move them to comply the more with him in other particulars.

3. That the abuſe of Church-governement is no good argument againſt the thing it ſelf: *There being no authority ſo good, ſo neceſſary in Church or State, but by reaſon of their corruptions who manage it, may be abuſed to tyranny and oppreſſion.* Theſe are Mr. *Prinnes* words, *Vindic. of the 4. Queſtions* pag. 2.

(h) Eraſtus confirm. Theſ. lib. 3. cap. 1. *Veruntamen ut in rebus prophanis curandis ei (Magiſtratui) non licet terminos & fines æquitatis, juſtitiæ ac honeſtatis, hoc eſt præſcriptionem legum & ſtatutorum Reip. tranſcendere. Sic in diſponendis & ordinandis rebus ſacris, vel ad cultum divinum pertinentibus, longe minus ei licet nulla in parte, a præſcripto verbi Dei diſcedere; quod tarquam regulam in omnibus debet ſequi, ab eoquenuſquam vel latum pilum deflectere.* (i). Eraſtus ibid. *Intelligi hoc debet de ea Repub. dictum, in qua Magiſtratus & ſubditi, eandem profitentur Religionem, eamque veram. In hac dico duas diſtinctas juriſdictiones minime debere eſſe. In alia, in qua videlicet Magiſtratus falſam tuetur ſententiam, certo quodammodo tolerabilis videri fortaſſe poſſit diviſio rectionum.*

4. That some Jurisdiction belongs to Presbyteries by Divine Right. Mr. *Prynne* in his Epistle Dedicatory before the vindication of his four questions, saith, that his scope is, *not to take from our new Presbyteries, all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction due by Divine Right to them, but to confine it within certain definite limits, to prevent all exorbitant abuses of it.*

5. That the Christian Magistrate ought not, may not preach the Word, nor minister the Sacraments. Mr. *Coleman* in his *Brotherly examination re-examined* pag. 14. *I never had it in my thoughts that the Parliament had power of dispensing the Word and Sacraments:* Then so far there is a distinction of Magistracy and Ministery *Jure Divino*: Yet in this he did not so well agree with (k) *Erastus*.

(k) Confirm. Thes. lib. 4. cap. 2. *Quod addit non licere magistratui, re ita postulante, docere & Sacramenta administrare (si modo per negotia possit utrique muneri sufficere) id verum non est.*

6. That the ministery is *Jure Divino*, and Ministers have their power and authority of preaching the Word derived to them from *Christ*, not from the Magistrate. So Mr. *Hussey* in his Epistle to my self. *We preach the Word with all authority from Christ, derived to us by those of our Brethren that were in Commission before us. Magistrates may drive away false Teachers, but not the Preachers of the Gospel but at their utmost peril.*

7. They admit and allow of Presbyteries, so that they doe not exercise Government and Jurisdiction. *Erast. lib. 4. cap. 1.*

Our Concessions to our Opposites, are these.

1. That all are not to be admitted promiscuously either to be governours or members in the Ecclesiastical Republick, that is, in a visible political Church. None are to governe (l) nor to be abmitted members of Presbyteries or Synods, except such as both for abilities and conversation, are qualified according to that which the Apostle *Paul* requireth a Bishop or Elder to be. Scandalous or prophane Church-Officers are the worst of dogs and swine, and to be first cast out. And as all are not to governe, so all are not to be governed Ecclesiastically; but onely Church-Members, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. Therefore what hath been objected concerning many both Pastors and People in *England*, who are still branches of the old stock, doth not strike against what we hold. All are not fit for a Church-government. Therefore those that are fit shall not have a Church-Government. So they

(l) Bullinger de Conc. lib. 1. c. 8 *Si turpe aut indignum quondam videbatur gentes inducere in templum Dei: quare non videatur hodie sacrilegum, introducere in Synodum Ecclesiasticam canes & porcos.*

they must argue; Or thus, a Popish people are not fit to be governed Presbyterially, and Episcopal Ministers are not fit to governe; therefore the rest of the Nation shall want a Government.

2. Presbyteriall Government is not *despotical*, but *ministerial*, it is not a *Dominion*, but a *Service*. We are not *Lords over Gods heritage*: 1 *Pet.* 5. 3. but we are the servants both of *Christ* and of his *Church*. *We preach not our selves*, saith the Apostle, *but Christ Jesus the Lord, and our selves your servants for Jesus sake.* 2 *Cor.* 4. 5.

3. That power of Government with which Pastors and Elders are invested, hath for the object of it, not the external man, but the inward man. It is not, nor ought not to be exercised in any compulsive, coercive, corporal, or civil punishments. When there is need of coertion or compulsion, it belongs to the Magistrate, not to the Minister, though the question be of a matter of Religion; of Persons or things Ecclesiastical. Which as it is rightly observed by (m) *Salmasius*, so he further asserteth against the Popish Writers, that all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction hath for the object of it, onely the inward man; for consider the end of Church-censures, saith he, even when one is excommunicated or suspended from the Sacrament, it is but to reduce him and restore him by repentance, that he may again partake of the Sacrament rightly and comfortably: which repentance is in the soule or inward man, though the signes of it appear externally.

(m) Appar. ad lib. de primatu *pag.* 294. *Ubicunque sane imperio opus est per vim agente ac jubente, aut Jurisdictione cogente & coherente, nihil istic habent quod agant verbi divini ministri, neque jus agendi ullum, etiamsi de re aut persona Ecclesiastica quæstio sit, aut de Religione agatur, sed ad principes aut Magistratus ea vis coáctiva, & illud jus imperativum & coercitivum pertinet.* Ibid. *pag.* 295. *Jurisdictionem ijdem (pontificij Doctores) porro interiorem ac exteriorem ita distinguunt, ut interior sit qua Sacerdos possit peccatorem confessum a peccatis absolvere & satisfactionem ponere: exterior autem qua peccatores adstringit vinculo Anathematis, aliasque publicas censuras irrogat, & ab iisdem exsolvit. Verum hæ duæ Jurisdictiones unam faciunt, eamque solam interiorem. Nulla quippe exterior est, cum utraque respiciat & pro objecto habeat hominem interiorem, id est animam.* Ib. p. 297. *Finis tantum respici debet. Aliquis suspenditur & excommunicatur? Sane, sed ut per pœnitentiam restitui possit, & Sacramenta corporis & sanguinis Christi iterum participare. Et pœnitentia illa quam quis agit ut possit reconciliari, interioris est hominis.*

4. Presby-

4. Presbyterial Government is not an arbitrary Government; for clearing whereof take these five Considerations. 1. *We can do nothing against the Truth but for the Truth:* and the power which the Lord hath given us, is *to edification and not to destruction*, 2 *Cor.* 13 8 10. All Presbyterial proceedings must be levelled to this end, and squared by this rule. 2. Presbyters and Presbyteries are subject to the Law of the Land, and to the corrective power of the Magistrate; *Quatenus Ecclesia est in Republica, & Reipub. pars, non Respublica Ecclesia: In so far as the Church is in the Common-wealth, and a part of the Common-Wealth; not the Common-Wealth a part of the Church*, saith *Salmasius appar. ad lib. de Primatu* pag. 292. for which, pag. 300. he cites, *Optatus Milivitanus lib.* 3. *Non enim Respublica est in Ecclesia, sed Ecclesia in Republica.* Ministers and Elders are Subjects and Members of the Common-wealth, and in that respect punishable by the Magistrate, if they transgresse the Law of the Land. 3. Yea also as Church-Officers, they are to be kept within the limits of their calling, and compelled (if need be) by the Magistrate to do those Duties which by the clear Word of God and received principles of Christian Religion, or by the received Ecclesiastical Constitutions of that Church, they ought to do. 4. And *in corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*, I mean, if it shall ever happen (which the Lord forbid, and I trust shall never be) that Presbyteries, or Synods shall make defection from the Truth to Errour, from Holinesse to Prophanesse, from Moderation to Tyranny and Persecution, censuring the innocent and absolving the guilty, as Popery and Prelacy did, and there being no hopes of redressing such enormities in the ordinary way by intrinsecal Ecclesiastical remedies, that is, by well-constituted Synods, or Assemblies of Orthodox, holy, moderate Presbyters: In such an extraordinary exigence, the Christian Magistrate may and ought to interpose his Authority to do diverse things which in an ordinary course of Government he ought not to do; for in such a case, Magistracy (without expecting the proper intrinsecal remedy of better Ecclesiasticall Assemblies) may immediately, by it self, and in the most effectual manner, suppresse and restrain such defection, exorbitancy, and tyranny, and not suffer the unjust,

Hereti-

heretical, tyrannical Sentences of Presbyteries or Synods to be put in execution. Howbeit *in Ecclesia bene constituta*, in a well constituted and Reformed Church, it is not to be supposed, that the condition of affairs will be such as I have now said. We heartily acknowledge with Mr. *Cartwright annot. on Mat.* 22. *Sect.* 3. That it belongeth to the Magistrate, *to reforme things in the Church, as often as the Ecclesiastical persons shall either through ignorance, or disorder of the affection of covetuousnesse or ambition, defile the Lords Sanctuary. For* saith *Junius Animad. in Bell. contr.* 4. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. *&* 18. *Both the Church when the concurrence of the Magistrate faileth, may extraordinarily doe something which ordinarily she cannot: and again when the Church faileth of her duty, the Magistrate may extraordinarily procure, that the Church return to her duty.*

5. I dare confidently say, that if comparisons be rightly made, Presbyterial Government is the most limitted and the least Arbitrary Government of any other in the world. I should have thought it very unnecessary and superfluous, to have once named here the Papal Government, or yet the Prelatical, but that Mr. *Prynn* in his preface to his four grand Questions, puts the Reverend Assembly of Divines in mind, that they should beware of usurping that which hath been even by themselves disclaimed against, and quite taken away from the Pope and Prelats. Mr. *Coleman* also in his Sermon brought objections from the usurpations of Pope *Paul* the fift, and of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*: Well, if we must needs make a comparison, come on. The Papal usurpations are many. 1. The Pope takes upon him to determine what belongs to the Canon of Scripture, what not? 2. That he onely can determine what is the sence of Scripture. 3. He addeth unwritten Traditions. 4. He makes himself Judge of all controversies. 5. He dispenseth with the Law of God it self. 6. He makes himself above General Councels. 7. His government is Monarchical. 8. He receiveth appeals from all the Nations in the world. 9. He claimeth infallibility at least *ex Cathedra*. 10. He maketh Lawes absolutely binding the Conscience, even in things indifferent. 11. He claimeth a Temporal Dominion over all the Kingdoms in the world. 12. He saith he may depose

Kings, and absolve Subjects from their oath of allegiance. 13. He persecuteth all with fire and sword and Anathema's, who do not subject themselves to him. 14. He claimeth the sole power of convocating general Councels. 15. And of presiding or moderating therein by Himself or his Legates.

What Conscience or ingenuity can there now be, in making any parallel between Papall and Presbyteriall Government?

As little there is in making the comparison with Prelacy, the power whereof was indeed arbitrary and impatient of those limitations and rules which Presbyteries and Synods in the Reformed Churches walk by. For 1. The Prelate was but one, yet he claimed the power of ordination and jurisdiction as proper to himself in his owne Diocess. We give the power of ordination and Church censures not *uni*, but *unitati*, not to one, but to an Assembly gathered into one.

2. The Prelate assumed a perpetual precedency and a constant priviledge of moderating Synods, Which Presbyterial Government denyeth to any one man. 3. The Prelate did not tye himself either to aske or to receive advice from his fellow Presbyters, except when he himself pleased. But there is no Presbyteriall nor Synodicall sentence, which is not concluded by the major part of voices. 4. The Prelate made himself Pastor to the whole Dioceſſe (consisting it may be of some hundreds of Congregations), holding that the Ministers of particular Congregations did preach the Word and minister the Sacraments, in his name by vertue of authority and order from him, and because he could not act by himself in every Congregation. The Presbyteriall Government acknowledgeth no Pastorall charge of preaching the Word and ministring the Sacraments to more Congregations then one; and doth acknowledge the Pastors of particular Churches, being lawfully called, to have power and authority for preaching the Word and ministring the Sacraments in the name of Christ, and not in the name of the Presbyterie. 5. The Prelates as they denyed the power and authority of Pastors, so they utterly denyed the very offices of ruling Elders, and Deacons for taking more especiall care of the poor, in particular Congregations. 6. They did

did not acknowledge Congregationall Elderships, nor any power of discipline in particular Congregations which the Presbyteriall Government doth. 7. They intruded Pastors oft times against the consent of the Congregation, and *reclamante Eccl. siâ*, which the Presbyteriall Government doth not. 8. They ordained Ministers without any particular charge, which the Presbyterial Governement doth not. 9 In Synods they did not allow any but the Clergie alone (as they kept up the name) to have decisive suffrage. The Presbyterial Government gives decisive voices to ruling Elders aswell as to Pastors. 10. The Prelates declined to be accountable to and censurable by either Chapters, Diocesan or Nationall Synods. In Presbyteriall Government all (in whatsoever Ecclesiasticall administration) are called to an account in Presbyteries, Provinciall and Nationall Assemblies respectively, and none are exempted from Synodicall censures in case of scandall and obstinacy. 11. The Prelates power was not meerly Ecclesiasticall, they were Lords of Parliament, they held Civil places in the State, which the Presbyterial Government condemneth. 12. The Prelats were not chosen by the Church, Presbyters are. 13. The Prelates did presume to make Lawes binding the Conscience, even in things indifferent, and did persecute, imprison, fine, depose, excommunicate men for certain Rites and Ceremonies acknowledged by themselves to be indifferent (setting aside the will and authority of the Law makers) This the Presbyteriall Government abhorreth. 14. They did excommunicate for money matters, for trifles. Which the Presbyteriall Government condemneth. 15. The Prelates did not allow men to examine by the Judgement of Christian and private discretion, their Decrees and Canons, so as to search the Scriptures and look at the Warrants, but would needs have men think it enough to know the things to be commanded by them that are in place and power. Presbyteriall Government doth not lord it over mens consciences, but admitteth (yea commendeth) the searching of the Scriptures, whether these things which it holds forth be not so, and doth not presse mens Consciences with *Sic volo, sic jubeo*, but desireth they may doe in faith what they do. 16. The Prelates held up pluralities, non-residen-

cies, &c. Which the Presbyteriall Government doth not. 17. As many of the Prelates did themselves neglect to preach the Gospel, so they kept up in diverse places a reading non-preaching Ministery: Which the Presbyteriall Goverment suffereth not. 18. They opened the door of the Ministery to diverse scandalous, Arminianized, and popishly affected men, and locked the door upon many worthy to be admitted. The Presbyteriall Government herein is as contrary to theirs, as theirs was to the right. 19. Their Official Courts, Commissaries, &c. did serve themselves Heires to the sons of *Eli*, *Nay, but thou shalt give it me now, and if not, I will take it by force.* The Presbyterial Covernment hath such proceedings. 20. The Prelates and their High-Commission Court did assume *potestatem utriusq; gladij*, the power both of the Temporall and Civil Sword. The Presbyteriall Government medleth with no Civil nor Temporall punishments.

I do not intend to enumerate all the differences between the Papal and Prelatical Government on the one side, and the Presbyterial Government on the other side; in this point of unlimitednesse or arbitrarynesse. These differences which I have given, may serve for a consciencious caution to intelligent and moderate men, to beware of such odious and unjust comparisons, as have been used by some, and among others by Mr. *Saltmarsh* in his *Parallel between the Prelacy and Presbyterie*: Which as it cannot strike against us, nor any of the Reformed Churches (who acknowledge no such Presbyterie as he describeth) and in some particulars, striketh at the Ordinance of Parliament (as namely in point of the Directory) so he that hath a mind to a Recrimination, might with more truth lay diverse of those imputations upon those, whom (I beleeve) he is most unwilling they should be laid upon.

In the third place, The Presbyterian Government is more limited and lesse arbitrary than the Independent Government of single Congregations, which exempting themselves from the Presbyterial subordination, and from being accountable to, and censurable by Classes or Synods, must needs be supposed to exercise a much more unlimited or arbitrary power, than the Presbyterial Churches do: especially when this shall be compared

red and laid together with one of their three grand Principles, which disclaimeth the binding of themselves for the future unto their present judgement and practice, and avoucheth the keeping of this reserve to alter and retract. See their *Apologetical narration*, pag. 10, 11. By which it appeareth that their way will not suffer them to be so far moulded into an Uniformity, or bounded within certain particular rules (I say not with others, but even among themselves) as the Presbyterian way will admit of.

Finally, The Presbyterial Government hath no such liberty nor arbitrarinesse, as Civil or Military Government hath: there being in all civil or temporal affairs a great deal of latitude left to those who manage the same, so that they command nor act nothing against the Word of God. But Presbyterial Government is tyed up to the rules of Scripture, in all such particulars as are properly spiritual and proper to the Church; Though in other particular, occasional circumstances of times, places, accommodations, and the like, the same light of nature and reason guideth both Church and State; yet in things properly Spiritual and Ecclesiastical, there is not near so much latitude left to the Presbytery, as there is in civil affairs to the Magistrate.

And thus I have made good what I said, That Presbyterial Government is the most limited and least arbitrary Government of any other. All which Vindication and clearing of the Presbyterial Government, doth overthrow (as to this Point) Master *Hussey's Observation*, pag. 9. of the irregularity and arbitrarinesse of Church-government. And so much of my fourth Concession.

The fifth shall be this: 'Tis far from our meaning, that the Christian Magistrate should not meddle with matters of Religion, or things and causes Ecclesiastical, and that he is to take care of the Common-wealth, but not of the Church. Certainly there is much power and Authority which by the Word of God, and by the Confessions of Faith of the Reformed Churches, doth belong to the Christian Magistrate in matters of Religion. Which I do but now touch by the way, so far as is necessary to wipe off the aspersion cast upon

Presbyterial Government. The particulars I refer to Chapter 8.

Our sixth Concession is, That in extraordinary cases, when Church-government doth degenerate into tyranny, ambition, and avarice; and they who have the managing of the Ecclesiastical power, make defection and fall into manifest Heresy, Impiety, or Injustice, (as under Popery and Prelacy it was for the most part:) then, and in such cases (which we pray and hope we shall never see again) the Christian Magistrate may and ought to do diverse things in and for Religion, and interpose his Authority diverse wayes, so as doth not properly belong to his cognizance, decision, and administration, ordinarily, and in a Reformed and well constituted Church. For extraordinary diseases must have extraordinary remedies. More of this before.

A seventh Concession is this: The Civil Sanction added to Church-government and Discipline, is a free and voluntary Act of the Magistrate. That is, Church-government doth not *ex naturarei*, necessitate the Magistrate to aid, assist, or corroborate the same, by adding the strength of a Law. But the Magistrate is free in this, to do or not to do, to do more or to do less, as he will answer to God and his conscience: it is a cumulative Act of favour done by the Magistrate. My meaning is not, that it is free to the Magistrate, *in genere moris*; but *in genere entis*. The Magistrate ought to adde the Civil Sanction *hic & nunc*, or he ought not to do it. It is either a duty, or a sin; it is not indifferent. But my meaning is, The Magistrate is free herein from all coaction, yea from all necessity and obligation; other then ariseth from the Word of God, binding his conscience. There is no power on Earth, Civil or Spiritual, to constrain him. The Magistrate himself is his own Judge on Earth, how far he is to do any cumulative Act of favour to the Church. Which takes off that calumny, that Presbyterial Government doth force or compel the conscience of the Magistrate. I pray God we may never have cause to state the Question otherwise, I mean, concerning the Magistrate his forbidding what Christ hath commanded, or commanding what Christ hath forbidden: in which case we must serve Christ and our consciences, rather then obey

Laws

Laws contrary to the Word of God and our Covenant: whereas in the other case, of the Magistrate his not adding of the Civil Sanction, we may both serve Christ, and do it without the least appearance of disobedience to the Magistrate.

Eighthly, We grant that Pastors and Elders, whether they be considered distributively, or collectively in Presbyteries and Synods, being Subjects and Members of the Common-wealth, ought to be subject and obedient in the Lord to the Magistrate and to the Law of the Land; and as in all other duties, so in Civil subjection and obedience they ought to be *ensamples to the Flock*; and their trespasses against Law are punishable, as much, yea, more then the trespasses of other Subjects. Of this also before.

Ninthly, If the Magistrate be offended, at the sentence given, or censure inflicted by a Presbytery or a Synod, they ought to be ready in all humility and respect, to give him an acconnt and reason of such their proceedings, and by all means to endeavour the satisfaction of the Magistrate his conscience: or otherwise to be warned and rectified, if themselves have erred.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the agreements and differences between the nature of the Civil and of the Ecclesiastical Powers or Governments.

HAving now observed what our opposites yeeld to us, or we to them, I shall for further unfolding of what I plead for, or against, adde here the chief agreements and differences between the Civil and Ecclesiastical powers, so far as I apprehend them. They both agree in these things: 1. They are both from God; both the Magistrate, and the Minister is authorized from God, both are the Ministers of God, and shall give account of their administrations to God. 2. Both are tyed to observe the Law and Commandments of God: and both have certain directions from the Word of God to guide them in their administration. 3. Both Civil Magistrates and Church Officers are Fathers, and ought to be honoured and obeyed according to the fifth Commandment: *Utrumque scilicet dominium*, saith *Luther*, *Tom.* 1. *fol.* 139. both Governments, the Civil and the Ecclesiastical, do pertain to that Commandment. 4. Both Magistracy and Ministery are appointed for the glory of God as Supreme, and for the good of men as the subordinate end. 5. They are both of them mutually aiding and auxiliary, each to other. Magistracy strengthens the Ministery, and the Ministery strengthens Magistracy. 6. They agree in their general kinde; they are both Powers and Governments. 7. Both of them require singular qualifications, eminent gifts and endowments, and

and of both it holds true, *Quis ad hæc idoneus?* 8. Both of them have degrees of censures and correction according to the degrees of offences. 9. Neither the one nor the other may give out sentence against one who is not convict, or whose offence is not proved. 10. Both of them have a certain kind of Jurisdiction *in foro exteriori.* For though the Ecclesiastical power be spiritual, and exercised about such things as belong to the inward man onely; yet as Dr. *Rivet* upon the Decalogue, pag. 260. 261. saith truly, there is a two-fold power of external jurisdiction which is exercised *in foro exteriori*: one by Church-Censures, Excommunication, lesser and greater, which is not committed to the Magistrate, but to Church-Officers: Another, which is Civil and coercive, and that is the Magistrates. But Mr. *Coleman* told us, he was perswaded it will trouble the whole World to bound Ecclesiastical and Civil Jurisdiction, the one from the other; *Maledicis* pag. 7. Well: I have given ten agreements. I will now give ten differences.

The difference between them is great; they differ in their causes, effects, objects, adjuncts, correlations, executions, and ultimate terminations.

1. In the efficient cause. The King of Nations hath instituted the Civil power; The King of Saints hath instituted the Ecclesiastical power. I mean the most high God, possessor of Heaven and Earth, who exerciseth Soverainty over the workmanship of his own hands, and so over all mankind, hath instituted Magistrates to be in his stead, as gods upon Earth. But *Jesus Christ* as Mediator and King of the Church, whom his Father hath *set upon his holy Hill of Zion, Psal. 2. 6. to reigne over the House of Jacob for ever, Luke* 1. 33. who hath the key of the House of *David* laid upon his shoulder, *Isa.* 22. 22. hath instituted an Ecclesiastical power and goverment in the hands of Church-Officers, whom in his name he sendeth forth.

2. In the matter, Magistracy or Civil power hath for the matter of it the earthly Scepter and the Temporal Sword: that is, it is Monarchical and Legislative: it is also punitive or coercive of those that do evil; understand, upon the like reason,

remunerative of those that do well. (n) The Ecclesiastical power hath for the matter of it, the keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven. 1. The key of knowledge or doctrine, and that to be administred, not onely severally by each Minister *concionaliter*, but also Consistorially and Synodically in determining controversies of Faith, and that according to the rule of holy Scripture onely: which is *clavis δογματική*. 2. The key of order and decency, so to speak: by which the circumstances of Gods Worship and all such particulars in Ecclesiastical affairs, as are not determined in Scripture, are determined by the Ministers and ruling Officers of the Church, so as may best agree to the generall rules of the word concerning order and decency, avoyding of scandall, doing all to the glory of God, and to the edifying of one another. And this is *clavis διατακτική*. 3. The key of corrective discipline or censures to be exercised upon the scandalous and obstinate: which is *clavis κριτική*. 4. Adde also the key of Ordination or mission of Church-Officers, which I may call *clavis ἐξουσιαστική*, the authorizing or power giving key, others call it *missio potestativa*.

3. They differ in their formes. The power of Magistracy is *ἀρχιτεκτονική* and *δεσποτική*. It is an authority or dominion exercised in the particulars above mentioned, and that in an immediate subordination to God: for which reason Magistrates are called gods. The Ecclesiastical power is *ὑπηρετική*, or *διακονική*, or *οἰκονομική* onely. It is meerly Ministeriall and Steward-like, and exercised in an immediate subordination to *Jesus Christ*, as King of the Church, and in his name and authority.

4. They differ in their ends. The supreme end of Magistracy is onely the glory of God, as King of Nations, and as exercising dominion over the inhabitants of the earth: And in that respect the Magistrate is appointed to keep his Subjects within the bounds of external obedience to the moral Law, the obligation whereof lyeth upon all Nations, and all men. The supreme end of the Ecclesiastical power, is either *proximus* or *remotus*. The neerest and immediate end is the glory of *Jesus Christ*, as Mediator and King of the Church. The more remote end is the glory of God, as having all power and authority in

(n) Festus Hommius disp. 30. thes. 6. *Circa bonum spirituale versatur potestas Ecclesiastica propriè ita dicta, cujus proprium officium est verbum Dei prædicare, Sacramenta administrare, disciplinam Ecclesiasticam exercere, Ministros Ecclesiæ ordinare, de controversiis Ecclesiasticis quæ circa doctrinam aut regimen Ecclesiæ intercidunt, ordinarie judicare, & de ritibus adiaphoris ad ordinem, decorum atque ædificationem Ecclesiæ pertinentibus, Canones seu leges Ecclesiasticas constituere.* I. Gerard loc. com. Tom. 6. pag. 494. *Distinguitur Christi regnum ad quod potestas clavium pertinet, ab imperiis mundanis quæ gladio corporali in administratione utuntur.*

in heaven and earth. You will say, Must not then the Christian Magistrate intend the glory of *Jesus Christ*, and to be subservient to him as he is Mediator and King of the Church? Certainly he ought and must; and God forbid but that he should do so. But how? not *qua* Magistrate, but *qua* Christian. If you say to me again, Must not the Christian Magistrate intend to be otherwise subservient to the Kingdom of *Jesus Christ* as Mediator, then by personal or private Christian duties, which are incumbent to every Christian? I answer, no doubt he ought to intend more, even to glorifie *Jesus Christ* in the administration of Magistracy. Which that you may rightly apprehend, and that I be not misunderstood, take this distinction. It is altogether incumbent to the ruling Officers of the Church, to intend the glory of *Christ* as Mediator, even *ex natura rei*, in regard of the very nature of Ecclesiasticall power and government which hath no other end and use for which it was intended and instituted, but to be subservient to the Kingly office of *Jesus Christ* in the governing of his Church upon earth (and therefore *sublata Ecclesiâ perit regimen Ecclesiasticum*, take away the Church out of a Nation, and you take away all Ecclesiasticall power of government, which makes another difference from Magistracy, as we shall see anon.) But the Magistrate though Christian and godly, doth not *ex natura rei*, in regard of the nature of his particular vocation, intend the glory of *Jesus Christ* as Mediator, and King of the Church: but in regard of the common principles of Christian Religion, which do oblige every Christian in his particular vocation and station (and so the Magistrate in his) to intend that end. All Christians are commanded that whatever they do in word or deed, they do all in the name of the Lord *Jesus*, *Col.* 3. 17. that is, according to the will of *Christ*, and for the glory of *Christ*: And so a Marchant, a Mariner, a Tradesman, a School-master, a Captain, a Souldier, a Printer, and in a word, every Christian in his own place and station ought to intend the glory of *Christ*, and the good of his Church and Kingdom. Upon which ground and principle, if the Magistrate be Christian, it is incumbent to him so to administer that high and eminent vocation of his, that *Christ* may be glorified as King of the Church, and that this

Kingdom of *Chriſt* may flouriſh in his Dominions, (which would God every Magiſtrate called Chriſtian did really intend.) So then the glory of *Chriſt* as Mediator and King of the Church, is to the Miniſtery both *finis operis*, and *finis operantis*. To the Magiſtrate, though Chriſtian, it is onely *finis operantis*; That is, it is the end of the godly Magiſtrate, but not the end of Magiſtracy: whereas it is not onely the end of the godly Miniſter, but the end of the Miniſtery it ſelf. The Miniſters intendment of this end, flowes from the nature of their particular vocation. The Magiſtrates intendment of the ſame end, flowes from the nature of their general vocation of Chriſtianity, acting, guiding, and having influence into their particular vocation. So much of the ſupreme ends.

Now the ſubordinate end of all Eccleſiaſtical power, is, that all who are of the Church, whether Officers or members, may live godly, righteouſly, and ſoberly in this preſent world, be kept within the bounds of obedience to the Goſpel, void of all known offence toward God, and toward man, and be made to walk according to the rules delivered to us by *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. The ſubordinate end of the Civil power is, that all publike ſins committed preſumptuouſly againſt the moral Law, may be exemplarly puniſhed, and that peace, juſtice, and good order may be preſerved and maintained in the Commonwealth, which doth greatly redound to the comfort and good of the Church, and to the promoting of the courſe of the Goſpel: For this end the Apoſtle bids us pray for Kings, and all who are in Authority (though they be Pagans, much more if they be Chriſtians) *that we may live under them a peaceable and quiet life, in all Godlineſſe and Honeſty*: 1 *Tim.* 2. 2. He ſaith not ſimply, *that we may live in Godlineſſe and Honeſty*, but that we may both live peaceably and quietly, and alſo live godly and honeſtly: which is the very ſame that we commonly ſay of the Magiſtrate, that he is *Cuſtos utriuſq; Tabulæ*. He is to take ſpeciall care that all his Subjects be made to obſerve the Law of God, and live not onely in moral honeſty, but in Godlineſſe, and that ſo living, they may alſo enjoy peace and quietneſſe. More particularly; the end of Church cenſures is, that men may be aſhamed, humbled, reduced to repentance, that their ſpirit may

be

be saved in the day of the Lord. The end of civil punishments inflicted by the Magistrate is, That justice may be done according to Law, and that peace and good order may be maintained in the Common-wealth, as hath been said. The end of delivering *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* to *Satan*, was, *that they may learn not to blaspheme*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. *Erastus* yeelds to *Beza*, pag. 239. that the Apostle doth not say *Ut non possint blasphemare*, *that henceforth they may not be able to sin as they did before* (which yet he acknowledgeth to be the end of civil punishments,) but *that they may learn not to blaspheme*. Wherefore when he expounds ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, to no other sence but this, That the Apostle had delivered those two to be killed by *Satan*, *Ut non possint*, that they may not be able to blaspheme so any more; just as a Magistrate delivers a theef from the gallows, that he may not be able to steal any more, and (as he tels us some speak) that he may learn to steal no more: He is herein confuted, not onely out of the Text, but out of himself. So then, the end of Church-censures is ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, that the offenders may learn or be instructed to do so no more; which belongeth to the inward man or soul. The end of civil punishments is, *Ut non possint* (as *Erastus* tels us) that the offenders may not be able or at least (being alive and some way free) may not dare to do the like, the sword being appointed for a terrour to them who do evil, to restrain them from publike and punishable offences, not to work upon the spirit of their mindes, nor to effect the destroying of the flesh by mortification, that the spirit may be safe in the day of the Lord.

The fifth difference between the Civil and Ecclesiastical powers, is in respect of the effects. The effects of the Civil power are Civil Laws, Civil punishments, Civil rewards. The effects of the Ecclesiastical power, are Determinations of Controversies of Faith, Canons concerning Order and Decency in the Church, Ordination or Deposition of Church-Officers, Suspension from the Sacrament, and Excommunication. The powers being distinct in their nature and causes, the effects must needs be distinct, which flow from the actuating and putting in execution of the powers. I do not here speak of the effects of the Ecclesiastical power of Order, the dispensing of the

Word and Sacraments; but of the effects of the power of Jurisdiction or Government, of which onely the Controversie is.

Sixthly: The Civil power hath for the object of it τὰ ἐγκύκλια, the things of this life, matters of Peace, War, Justice, the Kings matters, and the Countrey-matters, those things that belong to the external man: But the Ecclesiastical power hath for the object of it, things pertaining to God, the Lords matters, as they are distinct from Civil matters, and things belonging to the inward man, distinct from the things belonging to the outward man. This difference Protestant Writers do put between the Civil and Ecclesiastical powers. *Fr. Junius Eccleſiaſt. lib. 3. cap. 4.* saith thus: *We have put into our definition humane things to be the ſubject of Civil adminiſtration: but the ſubject of Eccleſiaſtical adminiſtration, we have taught to be things Divine and Sacred. Things Divine and Sacred we call both thoſe which God commandeth for the ſanctification of our minde and conſcience, as things neceſſary; and alſo thoſe which the decency and order of the Church requireth to be ordained and obſerved, for the profitable and convenient uſe of the things which are neceſſary: For example, Prayers, the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments, Eccleſiaſtical cenſure, are things neceſſary and eſſentially belonging to the Communion of Saints: but ſet dayes, ſet hours, ſet places, faſts, and the like, belong to the decency and order of the Church &c. But humane things we call ſuch as touch the life, the body, goods and good name, as they are expounded in the ſecond Table of the Decalogue; for theſe are the things in which the whole Civil adminiſtration ſtandeth.* *Tilen, Synt. part. 2. diſp. 32.* tels us to the same purpose, That Civil Government or Magistracy *verſatur circa res terrenas & hominem externum. Magiſtratus*, saith *Danæus Pol. Chriſt. lib. 6. cap. 1. inſtituti ſunt à Deo rerum humanarum quæ hominum ſocietati neceſſariæ ſunt, reſpectu, & ad earum curam.*

If it be objected, How can these things agree with that which hath been before by us acknowledged, that the Civil Magistrate ought to take special care of Religion, of the conservation and purgation thereof, of the abolishing idolatry and superstition; and ought to be *Cuſtos utriuſque Tabulæ*, of the first,

first, as well as second Table? I answer, That Magistrates are appointed, not onely for Civil Policy, but for the conservation and purgation of Religion, as is expressed in the Confession of Faith of the Church of *Scotland*, before cited, we firmly beleeve, as a most undoubted truth. But when Divines make the object of Magistracy to be onely such things as belong to this life and to humane society, they do not mean the object of the Magistrates *Care* (as if he were not to take care of Religion;) but the object of his Operation. The Magistrate himself may not assume the administration of the keys, nor the dispensing of Church-censures; he can but punish the external man with external punishments. Of which more afterwards.

The seventh difference stands in the Adjuncts: For 1. the Ecclesiastical power in Presbyterial or Synodical Assemblies, ought not to be exercised without prayer and calling upon the Name of the Lord, *Matth.* 18. 19. There is no such obligation upon the Civil power, as that there may be no Civil Court of Justice without prayer. 2. In divers cases Civil Jurisdiction hath been and is in the person of one man: But no Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is committed to one man, but to an Assembly in which two at least must agree in the thing, as is gathered from the Text last cited. 3. No private or secret offence ought to be brought before an Ecclesiastical Court, except in the case of contumacy and impenitency, after previous admonitions: This is the ordinary rule, not to dispute now extraordinary exceptions from that rule. But the Civil power is not bound up by any such ordinary rule: For I suppose, our opposites will hardly say (at least hardly make it good) that no Civil injury or breach of Law and Justice, being privately committed, may be brought before a Civil Court, except first there be previous admonitions, and the party admonished prove obstinate and impenitent.

The eighth difference stands in their correlations. The *Correlatum* of Magistracy is people embodied in a Common-wealth, or a Civil corporation. The *Correlatum* of the Ecclesiastical power is people embodied in a Church, or Spiritual corporation. The Common-wealth is not in the Church, but the Church is in the Common-wealth, that is, One is not therefore

fore in or of the Church, because he is in or of the Common-wealth, of which the Church is a part; but yet every one that is a Member of the Church, is also a Member of the Common-wealth, of which that Church is a part. The Apostle distinguisheth those that are without, and those that are within in reference to the Church, who were notwithstanding both sorts within in reference to the Common-wealth, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12, 13. The *Correlatum* of the Ecclesiastical power may be quite taken away by persecution, or by defection, when the *Correlatum* of the civil power may remain. And therefore the Ecclesiastical and the civil power do not *se mutuò ponere & tollere.*

Ninthly: There is a great difference in the ultimate termination. The Ecclesiastical power can go no further then Excommunication, or (in case of extraordinary warrants, and when one is known to have blasphemed against the holy Ghost) to *Anathema Maranatha.* If one be not humbled and reduced by Excommunication, the Church can do no more, but leave him to the Judgement of God, who hath promised to ratifie in Heaven, what his Servants in his Name, and according to his Will, do upon Earth. *Salmasius* spends a whole chapter in confuting the Point of the coactive and Magistratical Jurisdiction of Bishops. See *Walo Messal. cap. 6.* He acknowledgeth in that very place, *pag.* 455, 456, 459, 462. that the Elders of the Church have in common the power of Ecclesiastical Discipline, to suspend from the Sacrament and to excommunicate, and to receive the offender again upon the evidence of his repentance. But the Point he asserteth is, That Bishops or Elders have no such power as the Magistrate hath, and that if he that is excommunicate do not care for it, nor submit himself, the Elders cannot compel him. But the termination or *Quo usque* of the civil power, is most different from this. It is *unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment.* Ezra 7. 26.

Tenthly: They differ in a divided execution. That is, the Ecclesiastical power ought to censure sometime one whom the Magistrate thinks not fit to punish with temporal or civil punishments: And again, the Magistrate ought to punish with the temporal Sword, one whom the Church ought not to cut off

off by the Spiritual Sword. This difference *Parens* gives, *Explic. Catech. quæst.* 85. *art.* 4. and it cannot be denied: For those that plead most for Liberty of conscience, and argue against all civil or temporal punishments of Hereticks, do notwithstanding acknowledge, that the Church whereof they are Members ought to censure and excommunicate them, and doth not her duty except she do so. The Church may have reason to esteem one as an Heathen and a Publican that is no Church-Member, whom yet the Magistrate in prudence and policy doth permit to live in the Common-wealth. Again, the most notorious and scandalous sinners, blasphemers, murtherers, adulterers, incestuous persons, robbers, &c. when God gives them repentance, and the signes thereof do appear, the Church doth not binde but loose them, doth not retain but remit their sins; I mean ministerially and declaratively. Notwithstanding the Magistrate may and ought to do Justice according to Law, even upon those penitent sinners.

CHAP. V.

Of a twofold Kingdom of Jesus Christ: a general Kingdom, as he is the eternal Son of God, the Head of all Principalities and Powers, raigning over all creatures: and a particular Kingdom, as he is Mediator, raigning over the Church onely.

THe Controversie which hath been moved concerning the civil Magistrate his Vicegerentship, and the holding of his Office of and under and for Jesus Christ as he is Mediator, hath a necessary coherence with, and dependance upon another Controversie concerning a twofold Kingdom of Jesus Christ; one, as he is the eternal Son of God, raigning together with the Father and the holy Ghost over all things; and so the Magistrate is his Vicegerent, and holds his Office of and under him: another as Mediator and Head of the Church, and so the Magistrate doth not hold his Office of and under Christ as his Vicegerent. Wherefore before I come to that Question concerning the origination and tenure of the Magistrate's Office, I have thought good here to premise the enodation of the Question concerning the twofold Kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is a distinction which Master *Hussey* cannot endure, and

and no marvel; for it overturneth the foundation of his opinion. He looks upon it as an absurd assertion, pag. 25. *Shall he have one Kingdom as Mediator, and another as God?* He quarrelleth all that I said of the twofold Kingdom of Christ, and will not admit that Christ as Mediator is King of the Church onely, pag. 25, 26, 27, 35, 36, 37.

The Controversie draweth deeper then he is aware of: for *Socinians* and *Photinians* finding themselves puzzled with those arguments which (to prove the eternal Godhead of Jesus Christ) were drawn from such Scriptures as call him *God*, *Lord*, *the Son of God*; also from such Scriptures as ascribe Worship and Adoration to him; and from the Texts which ascribe to him a Supreme Lordship, Dominion, and Kingdom over all things: (For this hath been used as one Argument for the Godhead of Jesus Christ and his consubstantiality with the Father. *The Father raigns, the Son raigns, the holy Ghost raigns. Vide lib. Isaaci Clari Hispani adversus Varimadum Arianum:*) Thereupon they devised this answer, That Jesus Christ in respect of his Kingly Office, and as Mediator, is called *God*, and *Lord*, and *the Son of God*, (of which see *Fest. Hornij Specimen Controv. Belgic.* pag. 24. *Jonas Schlichtingius contra Meisnerum* pag. 436.) and that in the same respect he is worshipped, that in the same respect he is King, and that the Kingdom which the Scripture ascribeth to Jesus Christ, is onely as Mediator and Head of the Church, and that he hath no such Universal Dominion over all things as can prove him to be the eternal Son of God. This gave occasion to Orthodox-Protestant-Writters, more fully and distinctly to assert the great difference between that which the Scripture saith of Christ, as he is the eternal Son of God; and that which it saith of him, as he is Mediator: and particularly to assert a twofold Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and to prove from Scripture, that besides that Kingdom which Christ hath as Mediator, he hath another Kingdom over all things which belongs to him onely as he is the eternal Son of God. This the *Socinians* to this day do contradict, and stifly hold that Christ hath but one Kingdom, which he exerciseth as Mediator over the Church, and in some respect over all things; but by no means they admit that Christ as God

raigneth over all things: But our Writters still hold up against them the distinction of that twofold Kingdom of Jesus Christ. See *Stegmanni Photinianismus Disp.27. quæst.6.* The same distinction of the twofold Kingdom of Christ, as God, and as Mediator, is frequently to be found in Protestant Writers. See *Synops. pur. Theol. Disp.26. thes.* 53. *Gomarus in Obad. vers. ult.* The late English Annotations on 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. and many others. Let ° *Polanus* speak for the rest. See also the same distinction cleared and asserted by Master *Apollonius* in his *Jus Majestatis circa sacra, part.*1. pag.33. *& seq.*

(o) Synt. Theol. lib. 6. cap. 29. *Regnum Christi vel naturale est, vel donativum. Regnum Christi naturale est quod Christus a natura habet, estque communis totius Deitatis &c. Hoc Regnum etiam universale dicitur, quia est simpliciter in universa. At Regnum Christi donativum est quod Christus traditum a Patre ut θεανθρωπος accepit &c. Hoc Regnum est proprium Christi, quod ut Rex Mediator obtinet in persona sua: ac Regnum etiam singulare dicitur quia est peculiare in Ecclesia &c. Utque naturale Regnum obtinet jure naturæ, quia est naturalis filius Dei Patris: ita donativum Regnum obtinet jure donationis.*

The Arguments to prove that distinction of the twofold Kingdom of Christ, are these:

First, Those Kingdoms of which the one is accessory and adventitious to the Son of God, and which, if it were not, the want of it could not prove him not to be God: the other necessarily floweth from his Godhead, so that without it he were not God; are most different and distinct Kingdoms. But the Kingdom of Christ as Mediator, and the Kingdom of Christ as he is the eternal Son of God, are such. *Ergo:* If the Son of God had never received the Office of Mediator, and so should not have raigned as Mediator, yet he had been the natural Son of God; for this could not be a necessary consequence, He is the natural Son of God, Therefore he is Mediator; for he had been the natural Son of God, though he had not been Mediator, and though man had not been redeemed. But if you suppose that the Son of God raigns not as God with the Father and the holy Ghost, from everlasting to everlasting, then you must needs suppose that he is not the natural and eternal Son of God.

Secondly, Those Kingdoms of which the one is proper and personal to Jesus Christ God-man; the other is not proper and per-

personal, but common to the Father and the holy Ghost, are most different and distinct Kingdoms. But the Kingdom of Jesus Christ as Mediator, and his Kingdom as he is the eternal Son of God, are such. *Ergo:* That Kingdom which Christ hath as Mediator, by special dispensation of God committed to him, is his alone properly and personally: for we cannot say that the Father raigns as Mediator, or that the holy Ghost raigns as Mediator. But that Kingdom which Christ hath, as he is the eternal Son of God, is the very same consubstantially with that Kingdom whereby God the Father and God the holy Ghost do raign.

Thirdly, He that hath a Kingdom which shall be continued and exercised for ever, and a Kingdom which shall not be continued and exercised for ever, hath two distinct Kingdoms. But Jesus Christ hath a Kingdom which shall be continued and exercised for ever, namely, the Kingdom which he hath as the eternal Son of God; and another Kingdom which shall not be continued and exercised for ever, namely, the Kingdom which he hath as Mediator. *Ergo:* The eternity of the one Kingdom is not doubted of: But that the other Kingdom shall not be for ever exercised, that is, [p] that Christ shall not for ever raign as Mediator, is proved from 1 *Cor.* 15. 24, 25. Master *Hussey* pag. 35, 36, 37. goeth about to answer this Argument, which he confesseth to say something: and indeed it saith so much, that though he maketh an extravagant exception, (*Doth it appear*, saith he, *that the Kingdom that he shall lay down to God his Father, is not over all the world?*) yet he plainly yeelds the Point, which I was then proving. *Christ*, saith he, *in the day of Judgement shall lay down all the Office of Mediatorship.* I hope he will not say that Christ shall lay down at the day of Judgement that Kingdom which he hath as the eternal Son of God. So then I have what I was seeking, that Christ hath one Kingdom as Mediator, another as the eternal Son of God. And whereas Master *Hussey* holdeth that Christ as Mediator raigns over all things as the Vicar of his Father, we shall see anon the weakness of his Arguments brought to prove it. Mean while, I ask, What then is that Kingdom which belongs to Christ as the eternal Son of God, and which shall

(p) Synt. pur. Theol. Disp. 26. thes. 35. *Ipsi (Patri) suum quoque Sceptrum Mediatorium seu œconomicum traditurus dicitur, ut imperium mere divinum eadem gloria ac Majestate cum Patre, ergo suos electos in æternum exerceat.* Zach. Ursinus Tom. 1. pag. 398. *Christus Patri tradet Regnum post glorificationem Ecclesiæ, id est, desinet facere Officium Mediatoris.*

not be laid down, but continued for ever? Let him think on this Argument, Whatsoever belongs to that Kingdom which shall be continued for ever, and shall not be laid down at the day of Judgement, doth belong to Christ, not as Mediator, but as the eternal Son of God. But the general Power and Dominion, by which Jesus Christ exerciseth Soveraignty over all creatures without exception, doing to them and fulfilling upon them all the good pleasure of his Will, belongs to that Kingdom which shall be continued for ever, and shall not be laid down at the day of Judgement. *Ergo*: That general Power and Dominion by which Jesus Christ exerciseth Soveraignty over all creatures without exception, doing to them and fulfilling upon them all the good pleasure of his Will; doth belong to Christ, not as Mediator, but as the eternal Son of God. And thus I make a transition to another Argument.

Fourthly, He that hath a Kingdom administred by and in Evangelical Ordinances, and a Kingdom administred by his Divine Power, without Evangelical Ordinances, hath two different and distinct Kingdoms. But Jesus Christ hath a Kingdom administred by and in Evangelical Ordinances, and a Kingdom administred by his Divine power, without Evangelical Ordinances. *Ergo:* Doth not Jesus Christ raign over the Devils and damned Spirits by his Divine Power, reserving them in chains of darkness to the Judgement of the great day? But will Master *Hussey* say that Christ raigns over the Divels and damned Spirits as Mediator or by the same Kingdom by which he raigns in his Church by and in his Ordinances? Therefore we must needs say, That Christ hath one Kingdom as the eternal Son of God, another as Mediator.

Fifthly, He that hath a Kingdom in subordination to God the Father, and as his Vicegerent; and another Kingdom wherein he is not subordinate unto, but equal with God the Father, hath two most different Kingdoms. But Jesus Christ hath a Kingdom in subordination to God the Father, and another Kingdom wherein he is not subordinate unto, but equal with God the Father. *Ergo*: The Kingdom which Christ hath as Mediator doth (in regard of the Office of Mediatorship) constitute him in a subordination to his Father, whose

Com-

Commandments he executeth, and to whom he gives an account of his Miniſtration. So that though he that is Mediator, being the eternal Son of God, is equal with the Father; yet as Mediator, he is not equal with the Father, but ſubordinate to the Father, which our Divines prove from theſe Scriptures, *Iſai.*42.1. *Behold my ſervant. Jo.* 14.28. *My Father is greater then I. 1 Cor.*11. 3. *The Head of Chriſt is God:* In the ſame conſideration as Chriſt is our Head, God is Chriſts Head, namely, as Chriſt is Mediator. But that Kingdom which Chriſt hath as he is the eternal Son of God, he holds it not in a ſubordination to God the Father; but as being conſubſtantial with his Father, and thinking it no robbery to be called equal with God: So that in this conſideration, the Father is not greater then he. Maſter *Huſſey* pag. 37. ſaith of Chriſt, in reſpect of the Government which he hath as Mediator, *He is as it were the Vicar of his Father.* I hope he will not ſay ſo of that Government which Chriſt hath as the eternal Son of God. And pag. 27. he holds that Chriſt as Mediator is ſubject to God; *But in the conſideration that Chriſt is the ſecond perſon of Trinity, ſo he is not inferior to God the Father.* So that he himſelf cannot but yeeld my Argument.

Sixthly, If Chriſt hath a Kingdom in time diſpenſed and delegate to him, and unto which he was anointed, and hath another Kingdom which is not delegate nor in time diſpenſed, nor he anointed to it; but doth neceſſarily and naturally accompany the communication of the Divine nature to him by eternal generation: then he hath two moſt different Kingdoms, one as he is Mediator; another as he is the eternal Son of God. But Chriſt hath a Kingdom in time diſpenſed and delegate *&c.* If you ſpeak of Chriſt as Mediator, God hath made him both Lord and Chriſt, *Act.*2. 36. but as he is the eternal Son of God he is not *Dominus factus*; he is not made Lord and King, no more then he is made the natural Son of God. When the Pſalmiſt ſpeaketh of that Kingdom which Chriſt hath as Mediator, he tels us of the anointing of Chriſt. *Pſ.* 45. 6. *The Scepter of thy Kingdom is a right Scepter:* verſ. 7. *Thy God hath anointed thee with the oyle of gladneſſe.* But we cannot ſay that Chriſt was anointed to that Kingdom, which he hath as the eternal Son of God.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, If the Scripture holds forth a Kingdom which Christ hath over all creatures, and another Kingdom which he hath over the Church onely; then it holds forth the twofold Kingdom which I plead for, and which Master *Hussey* denieth. But the Scripture holds forth *&c.* Christ as he is *God over all, blessed for ever, Rom. 9. 5.* exerciseth Soveraignty and Dominion over all things, even as his Father doth, *Psal. 115. 3. Dan. 4 34, 35.* for his Father and he are one. But as he is Mediator, his Kingdom is his Church onely, and he is *over his own House, Heb. 3. 6.* You will say the word *onely* is not in Scripture. I answer: When we say that Faith onely justifieth, the word *onely* is not in Scripture, but the thing is. Just so here: For, first, *David, Solomon,* and *Eliakim* were types of Christ the King. Now *David* and *Solomon* did raign onely over Gods people as their Subjects, though they had other people tributaries and subdued: So doth Christ raign over the House of *Jacob* onely, Luk. 1. 32, 33. *The Lord shall give unto him the Throne of his Father* David, *and he shall raign over the house of* Jacob *for ever.* Isai. 9. 7. *Of the encrease of his Government and Peace there shall be no end, upon the Throne of* David *and upon his Kingdom to order it.* Isa. 21. 22. *I will commit the Government into his hand, and he shall be a Father to the Inhabitants of* Jerusalem, *and to the house of* Judah, *and the key of the house of* David *will I lay upon his shoulder.* 2. It was foretold and applied to the Church and people of God as a proper and peculiar comfort to the Church, that Christ was to come and raign as a King: Isai. 9. 6. *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his shoulder.* Zech. 9. 9. *Rejoyce greatly O Daughter of* Zion: *Shout O Daughter of* Jerusalem: *Behold THY KING cometh unto thee.* Matth. 2. 6. *Out of thee shall come a Governour that shall rule my people* Israel. 3. The *Jews* did generally understand it so, That the *Messias* was to be the Churches King onely, which made *Pilate* say to them, *Shall I crucifie your King?* And hence it was also, that the wise men who came to enquire for Christ, said, *Where is he that is born King of the* Jews? Matt. 2. 2.

Eighthly, That very place *Eph. 1. 21, 22, 23.* from which Master *Coleman* drew an Argument against us, doth plainly hold

hold forth a two-fold ſupremacy of *Jeſus Chriſt*, one over all things, another in reference to the Church onely which is his body, his fulneſſe, and to whom alone he is head, according to that Text: Of which more afterwards.

Ninthly, The Apoſtle *Col.* 1. doth alſo diſtinguiſh this two-fold preeminence, ſupremacy, and Kingdom of *Jeſus Chriſt*: one, which is univerſal, and over all things, and which belongeth to him as he is the eternal Son of God, verſ. 15. 16. 17. *Who is the Image of the Inviſible God, the firſt born of every creature: For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers: all things were created by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt.* (q) Another which is œconomicall and particular in and over the Church, and this he hath as Mediator: verſ. 18. *And he is the head of the body the Church: Who is the beginning, the firſt born from the dead, that in all things he might have the preeminence.* That verſ. 18. he ſpeaketh of *Chriſt* as Mediator, is not controverted. But Mr. *Huſſey* pag. 35. would fain make it out (if he could) that *Chriſt* as Mediator is ſpoken of, verſ. 15. 16. 17. The Apoſtle indeed in that which went before did ſpeak of *Chriſt* as Mediator. But the ſcope of theſe three verſes is to prove the God-head of *Jeſus Chriſt*. Yea, Mr. *Huſſey* himſelf yeeldeth, that as God and not as Mediator he did create the world. How can he then contend that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh here of *Chriſt* as Mediator? and why doth he find fault with my expoſition that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh here of *Chriſt* as God? Do not our Writers urge *Col.* 1. 16. 17. againſt the *Socinians* and *Photinians*, to prove the eternal God-head of *Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe by him all things were created, and he is before all things. See *Stegmanni Photinianiſmus diſp.* 5. *Quæſt.* 12. *Becmanus Exercit.* 4. and *Exerc.* 8. Where you may ſee, that the Adverſaries contend (as Mr. *Huſſey* doth) that the Apoſtle verſ. 15. 16. 17. doth not ſpeak of the perſon of *Jeſus Chriſt*, proving him to be true God; but that he ſpeaks of *Chriſt* as Mediator or in reſpect of his Office, and of that dominion which *Chriſt* hath as Mediator (So *Jonas Schlichtingius contra Meiſner.* pag. 469.) and that verſ. 15. 16. 17. aſcribeth no more to *Chriſt*, than

(q) Calv. in Col. 1. 18. *Poſtquam generaliter de Chriſti excellentia diſſeruit, deque ſummo ejus in omnes creaturas principatu: iterum redit ad ea quæ peculiariter ad Eccleſiam ſpectant. In nomine capitis alii plura conſiderant &c. Hic vero potiſſimum, meo judicio, de gubernatione loquitur.*

than vers. 18. But *Beckmanus* answering *Julius*, distinguisheth the Text as I do: for which Analysis I did formerly cite *Beza*, *Zanchius*, *Gualther*, *Bullinger*, *Tossanus*, M. *Bayne*, beside diverse others. But I have found none that understands the Text as Mr. *Hussey* doth, except the *Socinians* and *Photinians*, who do not acknowledge that *Christ* hath such an universall dominion and Lordship over all things, as God the Father, but onely that he ruleth over all things, as Mediator.

Now for answer to that which Mr. *Hussey* pag. 26. 27. alledgeth, to prove that *Christ* as Mediator reigneth over all things, First, he tells us out of *Diodati* that *Christ* is head of the Church, and King of the Universe, and out of *Calvin*, that the Kingdom of *Christ* is over all, and filleth heaven and earth: But who denieth this? That which he had to prove, is, that *Christ* as Mediator, is King of the Universe, and as Mediator his Kingdom is spread over all: and when he hath proved that, he hath another thing to prove, that the universality of *Christs* Kingdom as he is Mediator, is to be understood not onely in an Ecclesiastical notion, that is, so far as all Nations are or shall be brought under the obedience of the Gospel; but also in the notion of Civil Government, that is, that *Christ* reignes as Mediator over all creatures, whether under or without the Gospel: and that all Civil Power, Principality, and Government whatsoever in this World, is put in *Christs* hand as Mediator. If therefore he will argue, let him argue so, as to conclude the point.

The next objection he maketh, is from *Heb.* 1. 2. Christ as Mediator is made *Heir of all things.*

But I answer, *Christ* is Heir of all things. 1. as the eternall Son of God, in the same respect as it is said of *Christ* in the next words of the same verse, that he made the world: and thus he may be called Heir of all things by nature, even as *Col.* 1. 15. he is called *the first borne of every creature.* 2. He is heir of all things as Mediator, for the Heathen and all the ends of the earth are given him for an inheritance, *Psal.* 2. 8. but that is onely Church-wise, he shall have a Catholique Church gathered out of all Nations, and all kings and people, and tongues, and languages shall be made to serve him.

Moreover

Moreover *Mr. Hussey* objecteth from *Heb.* 2. 8. and 1 *Cor.* 15. 28 that God hath put all things under *Christs* feet as he is Mediator. *Answ.* As this is not perfectly fulfilled in this World, but will then be fulfilled when *Christ shall have put down all rule and all authority, and power*: so in the measure and degree wherein it is fulfilled in this World, it concerneth not men onely, but all the works of Gods hands, *Heb.* 2. 7. *Thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands.* Which is taken out of the eighth *Psalme*, vers. 6. 7. *Thou hast put all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen &c.* Now how is it that the Apostle applyeth all this to *Christ*? How doth *Christ* rule over the beasts, fowles, fishes? *Calvin in* 1 *Cor.* 15. 27. 28. answereth, *dominatur ergo, ut omnia serviant ejus gloriæ. He ruleth, so as all things may serve for his glory.* So then, all things are put under *Christs* feet as he is Mediator, both in regard of his excellency, dignity, and glory unto which he is exalted far above all the glory of any creature; and in respect of his power and over-ruling providence whereby he can dispose of all things so as may make most for his glory. But it is a third thing which *Mr. Hussey* hath to prove, namely, that *Christ* as Mediator exerciseth his office and government over all men as his Subjects, and over all Magistrates as his Deputies, yea over all things, even over the reasonlesse creatures; for by his arguing, he will have *Christ* as Mediator to governe the sheep, oxen, fowles, and fishes: *all things* as well as *all persons* being put under *Christs* feet. But in the handling of this very argument *Mr. Hussey* yeelds the cause. *God is said to put all things under him*, saith he, *whereby it is implyed that all things were not under him, before they were put under him; but as the second Person in Trinity, so nothing could be said to be put under him, because they were in that respect alwaies under him.* Is not this all one for substance with that distinction formerly cited out of *Polanus*, of a two-fold Kingdom of *Christ*, one *natural*; as he is the second Person in the Trinity, another *donative*, as he is Mediator?

Lastly, *Mr. Hussey* argueth from *Phil.* 2. 8. 9. 10. *Christ* as Mediator is exalted to have a name above every name, that at the name of *Jesus* every knee may bow. *Answ.* Here is indeed *a*

dignity, glory, and power, as *Diodati* saith, above all things, but yet not a government or kingdom, as Mediator: for those who must bow the knee to *Christ*, are not onely things *in heaven*, that is, Angels, and things *in earth*, that is, men, bnt also things *under the earth*, that is, divells, yet divells are none of the Subjects of *Christs* kingdom as he is Mediator. Therefore this Text proves not a Head-ship or Government over all, (which *Mr. Hussey* contends for) but a power over all.

I will here anticipate another objection, which is not moved by *Mr. Hussey*. It may be objected from 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. *that the head of every man is Christ.* I answer, 1. Some understand this of *Christ* as God, and as the Creator of man. And if it be said that the latter clause *the head of Christ is God*, is meant of *Christ* as Mediator, and not as God: yet *Martyr* tells us out of *Chrysostome*, that all these comparisons and subordinations in this Text, are not to be taken in one and the same sence. 2. I grant also that *Christ* may be called the head of every man, not onely in respect of his God-head, but as Mediator, that is, the head of every man in the Church, not of every man in the World: for the Apostle speaks, *de ordine divinitus sancito in Ecclesiæ corpore mystico*, as *Mr. David Dickson* (an Interpreter who hath taken very good pains in the Textuall study of Scripture) saith upon the place. I shall clear it by the like formes of speech. *Jer.* 30. 6. *Wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loyns? Luke* 16. 16. *The Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth unto it.* 1 *Cor.* 12. 7. *The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withall. Heb.* 2. 9. *Jesus did taste death for every man.* Yet none of these places are meant of every man in the World. 3. Yea in some sence *Christ*, as Mediator, may be called the head of every man in the World, that is, in respect of dignity, excellency, glory, eminence of place, *quia in hoc sexu ille supra omnes eminet*, saith *Gualther*, or because no man hath parity or equality of honour with *Christ*: So *Martyr* and *Hunnius*. The English annotations say, that *Christ* is the Head of every man, *in as much as he is the first begotten among many brtheren.* Which best agreeth with my second answer.

But for taking off all these, and for preventing of other objections,

jections, that one distinction will suffice, which I first gave in examining *Mr. Colemans* Sermon. In the Mediator *Jesus Christ* there is, 1. ὑπεροχὴ or δόξα, dignity, excellency, honour, glory, splendor. 2. Δύναμις, his mighty power, by which he is able to do in heaven and earth whatsoever he will. 3. Βασιλεία his Kingdom, and Kingly-office or government. Which three as they are distinguished in God, *Thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory*: Why not in the Mediator also? In the first two respects, *Christ* as Mediator is over all things, and so over all men, and so over all Magistrates, and all they in subjection to him. But in the third respect the relation is onely between *Christ* and his Church, as between *King* and *Kingdom*. So that the thing in difference, is that which *Mr. Hussey* hath not proved, namely, that *Christ* as Mediator doth not onely excell all things in glory, and exercise a supreme power and providence over all things, for his own glory, and his Churches good (neither of which is denied) but that he also is as Mediator, King, Head, and Governor of the Universe, and hath not onely the government of his Church, but all Civil government put in his hand. When *Mr. Hussey* pag. 28. saith that I denyed pag. 43. what this distinction yeeldeth, namely, that *Christ* as Mediator exerciseth acts of divine power in the behalf and for the good of his Church, it is a calumny: for that which I denied pag. 43. was concerning the Kingdom, not the power: my words were these. *But as Mediator he is onely the Churches King, Head, and Governour, and hath no other Kingdom.* Yea himself, pag. 26. speaking to these words of mine, noteth that I did not say, that as Mediator he hath no such power. How commeth it to passe that he chargeth me with the denying of that, which himself but two pages before had observed that I denie it not?

Well, but pag. 43, he desires from me a further clearing of my distinction, *Kingdom, power, and glory*, and that I will shew from Scripture, how it agreeth to *Christ*. I shall obey his desire: though it was before easie to be understood, if he had been willing enough to understand. *Solomon* did excell all the Kings of the earth in wisedom, riches, glory, and honour, 2 *Chron.* 1. 12. and herein he was a type

of *Christ*, *Psal.* 89. 27. *I will make him my first born, higher then the Kings of the earth* : But as *Solomon* was onely King of *Israel*, and was not by office or authority of Government, a Catholique King over all the Kingdomes of the World, nor all other Kings *Solomons* Vicegerents, or Deputies : So *Jesus Christ* as Mediator is onely the Churches King, and is not King or Governour of the whole World, nor Civil Magistrates his Vicegerents, though he excell them all in dignity, glory, and honour. Again, *David* did subdue by power diverse States, Provinces, and Kingdoms, and make them tributary. But was *David* King of the *Philistines*, and King of the *Moabites*, and King of the *Syrians*, and King of the *Edomites*, because he smote them and subdued them, 2. *Sam.* 8. Nay it is added, in that very place vers. 15. *And David reigned over all Israel, and David executed justice and judgement unto all his people.* (And this is one argument to prove that those subdued and tributrary Territories, were not properly under the government of Israel, because Israel was not bound to extirpate Idolaters out of those lands, but onely out of the holy land. See *Maimonides de Idolol. cap.* 7. *sect.* 1. with the annotation of *Dionysius Vossius.*) So *Christ* who was set upon the throne of *David*, doth as Mediator, put forth his divine and irresistible power in subduing all his Churches enemies, according to that *Psal.* 2 9. *Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in peeces like a Potters vessel. Rev.* 17. 14. *The Lamb shall overcome them, for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings.* But this *vis major*, this restraining subduing power makes not Christ, as Mediator, to be King and Governour, not onely of his Church, but of the whole World beside. Yea the power of Christ is over all things, as well as all persons, over all beasts, fowles, and fishes; *Heb.* 2. 7. 8. compared with *Psal.* 8. 7. 8. Yea his power is over divells, meant by things under the earth, *Phil.* 2. 10. Wherefore it cannot be said, that Christ as Mediator, is King, Head, and Governour of all those whom he excelleth in glory, or whom he hath under his power, to do with them what he will. It is a strange mistake when *Mr. Hussey* pag. 43. objecteth against this distinction, that a Kingdom without power and glory, is a nomi-

a nominall empty thing. Surely there may be a Kingly right and authority to governe, where there is little either power or glory. But this is nothing to my distinction, which doth not suppose a Kingdom without power and glory, nor yet power and glory without a Kingdom, but onely that the Kingdom and Government is not to be extended to all those whom the King excelleth in glory (for then one King that hath but little glory, shall be subject to a King that hath much glory:) or over whom the King exerciseth acts of power, (for then the King shall be King to his and his Kingdomes enemies) I verily beleeve that this distinction rightly apprehended, will discover the great mistakes of that supposed universall Kingdom of Christ, as Mediator, reigning over all things, and the Civil Magistrate as his Vicegerent.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Whether Jesus Christ, *as Mediator and head of the Church, hath placed the Christian Magistrate to hold and execute his Office under and for him, as his Vicegerent. The Arguments for the Affirmative discussed.*

MR. *Hussey* is very angry at my distinctions and arguments which I brought against Mr. *Colemans* fourth rule, insomuch that in his Reply to me, he spendeth very near two parts of three upon this matter, from pag. 16. to 44. having past over *sicco pede* much of what I had said of other points in difference. Come now therefore and let us try his strength in this great point. He holds that Christ as Mediator hath placed the Christian Magistrate under him, and as his Vicegerent, and hath given him commission to govern the Church, which if he or any man can prove from the Word of God, it will go far in the decision of the Erastian controversie: though this is not all which is incumbent to the Erastians to prove, for as I first replied to Mr. *Colemans* fourth rule, the Question is, whether there be not some other government instituted and appointed by *Jesus Christ* to be in his Church beside the Civil Government: and if it should be granted that Christ even as Mediator hath committed, delegated and institu-

ted

ted Civil Government in his Church, yet they must further prove, that Christ hath committed the whole and sole power of Church-Government to the Magistrate, and so hath left no share of Government to the Ministery. But I can by no means yeeld that so much contended for Vicegerentship of the Christian Magistrate, and his holding of his Office of and under Christ as he is Mediator.

Mr. Coleman in his re-examination pag. 19. was fearfull to set his foot upon so slippery ground. He was loth to adventure upon this assertion, that Magistracy is derived from Christ as Mediator by a Commission of Deputation and Vicegerentship (which yet did necessarily follow upon the fourth rule which he had delivered in his Sermon) Wherefore he made a retreat and held him at this, *That Magistracy is given to* Christ *to be serviceable in his Kingdom.* But out steps *Mr. Hussey* and boldly averrs a great deal more: I much mistake if he shall not be made either to make a retreat as *Mr. Coleman* did, or to do worse.

First of all, this part of our Controversie is to be rightly stated. The Question is not. 1. Whether the Magistrate be Gods Deputy or Vicegerent, and as God upon earth; for who denies that? Nor 2. Whether the Magistrate be Christs Deputy as Christ is God, and as he exerciseth an universall dominion over all things, as the Father and the holy Ghost doth. Here likewise I hold the affirmative. Nor 3. Whether the Christian Magistrate be usefull and subservient to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, even as he is Mediator and King of the Church; for in this also I hold the affirmative, that is, that as every man in his owne calling, parents, masters, servants, marchants, souldiers &c. being Christians, so the Magistrate in his eminent station, being a Christian, is obliged to endeavour the propagation of the Gospel, and the good and benefit of the Church of Christ. But the Question is, Whether the Christian Magistrate be a Governour in the Church *Vice Christi*, in the room and stead of Jesus Christ as he is Mediator. Or (which is all one) Whether the rise, derivation, and tenure of Christian Magistracy be from Jesus Christ under this formall consideration, as he is Mediator and head of the Church. Or (which

is also the same) whether Jesus Christ by vertue of that authority and power of Government which as Mediator, and as God-man, he received of the Father, hath substituted and given commission to the Christian Magistrate to govern the Church in subordination to him, as he governeth it in subordination to his Father. In all these *Mr. Hussey* is for the affirmative, I am for the negative. Let us hear his reasons. First pag. 16. He argueth from my concession. A Christian Magistrate is a Governour in the Church, said *Mr. Coleman*, This understood *sano sensu* I admitted. Now saith *Mr. Hussey*, *If the Church be Christs Kingdom, surely such as govern in it, must receive commission from him.* Which commission saith he, must be in this forme. *Christ the Mediator, King of his Church, doth appoint Kings and Civil Magistrates to govern under him.* Let him find this commission in Scripture, and I shall confesse he hath done much. Neither doth any such thing follow upon my Concession. For 1. It is one thing to govern in the Church, another thing to govern the Church: Christian parents, masters of Colledges, and the like, are Governours in the Church, that is, being within, not without the Church, yet as Parents or masters they are not Church-Governours. 2. I can also admit that the Christian Magistrate governeth the Church; and if this had been the concession, which is more then the other, it could not have helped him. For how doth the Magistrate govern the Church? not *qua* a Church, but *qua* a part of the Common-Wealth, as learned *Salmasius* distinguisheth, *Appar. ad lib. de primat.* pag. 292. 300. For the Common-wealth is not in the Church, but the Church in the Common-wealth, according to that *Rev.* 2. *The Church in Smyrna, the Church in Pergamus, the Church in Thyatira.* And suppose all that are members of the Common-wealth to be also Church-members, yet in an universall-spread of the Gospel, the Church is governed by the Magistrate as it is a Common-wealth, not as it is a Church. Every soule must be subject to the higher powers, Church-Officers, Church-members and all, but the ἢ πῶπν *qua tale*, and ᾧ δ' ὃ *quo ad*, is not any Ecclesiastical or spiritual, but a humane and civil relation. But whereas *Mr. Hussey* addeth that the Gospel is the Law by which Christ will judge all the world:

if

if all the world be under the Law of Christ, then the Kingdom of Christ must needs reach over all the World: his proofes are meer mistakes: he cites 2. *Thess.* 1. 7. 8. Christ shall come *in flaming fire, to take vengeance on all them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*: but in that place they that obey not the Gospel, are those disobedient persons to whom the Gospel was preached: He cites also *Rom.* 2. 16. *Judge all the World according to my Gospel*: but the Text saith not so; it saith, *the secrets of men*, not all the World. Wherefore as the Apostle there saith of the Law *vers.* 12. so say I of the Gospel, as many as have sinned without the Gospel, shall also perish without the Gospel; and as many as have sinned under the Gospel, shall be judged by the Gospel.

Secondly, He draweth an argument the strength whereof is taken from *Psal.* 2. 8. *Ask of me and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession*: and from 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. our Lord Jesus Christ is said to be *King of kings, and Lord of lords*: Jesus, Christ, being names that agree to him onely as Mediator.

Answ. Christ as Mediator hath right to the whole earth, and all the kingdoms of the World, not as if all government (even civil) were given to Christ (for in this kind he governeth not so much as any part of the earth as he is Mediator) which was the thing he had to prove: but it is meant onely of his spiritual kingdom, which is not of this world, and in this respect alone it is, that Christ as Mediator hath right to the government of all Nations, he hath *jus ad rem*, though not *in re*. As for that title *King of kings, and Lord of Lords*, it may be understood two wayes. First, as Christ is the eternal and natural Son of God, the eternal wisdom of God, by whom Kings reigne, and Princes decree justice, *Prov.* 8. 15. 16. which is spoken of Christ, as he was the Fathers delight, and as one brought up with him before the foundation of the World: *Ibid. vers.* 22. to 30. Neither can the names of Jesus and Christ prove that what is said there must needs be meant of him as Mediator, mark how well grounded *Mr. Hussey's* arguments are. *Jesus sate at meat in Simon the Pharisees house. Luke* 7. 37. *Jesus wept for Lazarus because he loved him. John* 11. 35. 36. Must we needs therefore

say, that as Mediator he sate at meat in the Pharisees house, and as Mediator he wept for *Lazarus*? *Christ* is the Son of *David*, *Matth.* 22. 42. Must we therefore say that as Mediator he is the Son of *David*? Christ is *God over all, blessed for ever. Rom.* 9. 5. Must we therefore say that this is meant of Christ onely as Mediator? What is more ordinary then to use the names of Jesus and Christ when the thing which is said is meant in reference to one of the natures? Secondly, Christ is *King of kings, and Lord of lords*, even as Mediator: not in *Mr. Hussey's* sence, as if Kings had their commission from Christ, and did reigne in his stead, as he is Mediator; but in the sence of the Hebraisme, *Vanity of vanities*, that is, *most vain*; *holy of holies*, that is, *most holy*; so *King of kings, and Lord of lords*, that is, the most excellent glorious King of all others: the excellency, splendor, dignity, and majesty of Kings may be compared without any subordination. *Drusius Praeterit. lib.* 8. upon this very place which *Mr. Hussey* objecteth, saith that this forme of speech, *King of kings, and Lord of lords*, was taken from the Persians and Assyrians, who called a great King, King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Thirdly, *The Kingdom of Christ* saith *Mr. Hussey, is as ample as his Prophecy; but the Prophecie of Christ is extended to all Nations, as may appear by the commission, Go teach all Nations.* But 1. I throw back the argument; Christs Kingdom and his Prophecie are commensurable: therefore as his prophecie is not actually extended to all Nations, except successively, as the Gospel commeth among them, so his Kingdom, as he is Mediator, is extended no further then the Church, not to all Nations. 2. His argument therefore is a miserable fallacy *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter.* Christs prophecy is extended to all Nations successively, and when the Gospel comes among them, therefore his Kingdom is simply extended to all Nations, and is not bounded within the Church onely.

Fourthly, He tells us pag. 17. *if kings may be called holy, if their Offices may be accounted holy Offices, or not sinful, they must be held off and under Christ. Answ.* If he mean holy in opposition to civil, humane, worldly, secular, I denie the office of kings to be holy; if he mean holy in opposition to sinful, unlawful, unholy

holy (as it seems he doth) then I confesse the office of Kings is lawful not sinful, and themselves are holy when sanctified: but this proves not that they hold their office of and under Christ, more then carters or coblers hold their office of and under Christ: I am far from making a paralel between the Magistrate and these: but this I say, *Mr. Hussеys* plea for the Magistrate is no other than agreeth to these. And where he addeth out of *Calvin*, Kings have place in the Church, and flock of Christ, and are not spoiled of their Crown and Sword that they may be admitted into the Church; this in reference to the conclusion he driveth at, is no more than if he had argued thus, carters and coblers have place in the Church and flock of Christ, and are not necessitated to quit their secular calling that they may be admitted into the Church of Christ, therefore they hold their offices of and under Christ.

Fifthly, He argueth thus, *That Office which Christ hath declared to be of God, and bounded and limited in his Gospel, that Office is held under Christ as Mediator: But the Civil Magistrate is so, Rom.* 13. 4.

Answ. 1. His proposition is most false, and will never be proved. 2. If this argument hold good, then the Pagan Magistrate holds his office under Christ as Mediator (for of such Magistrates then in being, the Apostle meaneth, *Rom.* 13.) So that either he must recall what he saith here, or what he saith afterward, that the office of the Pagan Magistrate is sinful and unlawful. 3, By *Mr. Hussеys medium*, one might prove that servants hold their office under Christ as Mediator, because he hath declared their office to be of God, and hath bounded and limited the same in his Gospel. *Eph.* 6. 5 6,7,8.

Sixthly, He saith they be the same persons that are under Christ, and under the Magistrate, and further, *Christs ends and the Kings ends are both one*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 2. *that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlinesse and honesty.* Now either the office of the Mediators Kingdom is superior, or inferior, or co-ordinate, in reference to the Magistrates office.

Answ. 1. Very often they are not the same persons that are under Christ, and under the Magistrate. For 1 *Cor.* 5. 11, 12. the Apostle distinguisheth those that were *within*, or those

that were called brethren, from those that were *without*, both were under the Magistrate, both were not under Christ; and now the Jews in diverse places are under the Christian Magistrate, not under Christ. 2. The end of Christs kingly office, and the end of Magistracy are so different, that to say they are the same, is to offer indignity and dishonour to Jesus Christ. Kings are indeed appointed, that we may live under them a quiet and peaceable life in all godlinesse and honesty: But herein he hath answered himself pag. 29. *the civil Magistrate may require of the people, that they will attend upon the means, out of natural Principles, Deum esse & colendum.* More of the ends of Magistracy I have spoken before, whether I remit him. The ends of Christs Kingly Office are quite another thing; namely, to destroy all our soules enemies, Satan, the flesh, the wicked world, death, to put all his enemies under his feet; to send out his officers and ministers for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministery, for the edifying of the body of Christ, to govern his people by his Word and Spirit, and to keep them by the power of God through faith unto salvation. 3. The comparison between Christs Kingly office as Mediator, and the Magistrates office, is neither to be drawn from superiority and inferiority, nor co-ordination; for they are *disparata*, and differ *toto genere*.

And now I shall proceed for methods sake to examine other four Arguments from Scripture, upon which *Mr. Hussey* (though he doth not joyn them to the former six) afterward layeth no small weight for upholding that opinion, that the Magistrate holds his office of and under Christ, as he is Mediator.

The seventh argument therefore shall be that which he draweth from *Matth.* 28. 18. pag. 25. Whereunto I have two answers, according to two different applications of that Text. When Christ said *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*, it may be understood either as he is Mediator, or as he is the second person in the blessed Trinity, the eternall Sonne of God. So when the Ubiquitaries would prove from that place the reall communication of Divine omnipotency to the humane nature of Christ, our Divines answer, the Text may

be

be understood either of Christs person, God-man, or as he is the natural Son of God. See *Gomarus* upon the place. Now take the Text either way, it proves not what *Mr. Hussey* would. Let it be understood of Christ as God-man, and as Mediator, (which is the most promising sence for him) yet it cannot prove that all power without exception, and all government as well *without* as *within* the Church, as well *secular* as *Ecclesiastical*, is put in Christs hand as he is Mediator, and that the civil Magistrate holds his office of and under Christ: but the sence must be (r) All power which belongs to the Mediator, and all authority which belongs to the gathering and governing of the Church is given to me: for we must needs expound his meaning as himself hath taught us: *John* 18. 36. *Luke* 12. 14. We must not say that any such power is given to him, as himself denieth to be given to him, namely, civil power and Magistracy. Wherefore *Martin Bucer* in his *Scripta Anglicana*, pag. 273. doth rightly referre these words, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*, to the head *de Ecclesiæ œconomia*, and makes this Text paralel to *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you, &c. Whose soever sins ye remit, &c.* and to *Matth.* 16. 19. *I will give unto thee the keyes of the kingdom of Heaven: and Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.* And this is the πᾶσα ἐξουσία all authority or power in heaven and in earth, which is meant *Matth.* 28. 18. Which is further confirmed by the Syriack, which readeth thus verse 18. *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth: but as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Verse.* 19. *Goe therefore teach all Nations*: So restricting the sence to be in reference to the Church onely, and excluding civil government and Magistracy, from which Christ had before excluded his Apostles. *Medina in tertiam Partem, quæst.* 59. *art.* 4. holds the same thing, that the context and cohesion of vers. 18. and vers. 19. proves the Kingdom of Christ to be meerly spirituall.

(r) Greg. de Valentia. comment. in Thom. tom. 4. disp. 1. quæst. 32. punct. 6. *Si autem per omnem potestatem, secundo intelligamus ibi cum Hieronymo & Anselmo omnem potestatem necessariam quidem Christo ad gubernandam spiritualiter omnem Ecclesiam, tum in cœlo, ubi est caput & rex angelorum; tum in terra, ubi sunt homines, quorum item est rex & caput: satis constat non inde sequi quod acceperit etiam potestatem politicam.* Medina in tertiam partem, quæst. 59. art. 4. *Dicendum quod omnis potestas & auctoritas tribuenda est Christo, si tamen decens sit ad officium redemptionis; at quod fuerit rex temporalis totius orbis minime decuit Christum, ob idque istam auctoritatem non accepit.*

But

But 2. The Text will suffer yet a further restriction, namely that all power in heaven and in earth is said to given unto Jesus Christ, as he is the eternal Sonne of God, and that both in respect of the eternal generation by which the God-head, and so all Divine properties (of which omnipotency is one) was from all eternity communicated from the Father to the Son: and in respect of the declaration or manifestation of him to be the Son of God with power, when God raised him from the dead. *Mr. Hussey* saith he is astonished to hear that any thing should be given to Christ, as God; Where first of all I observe how miserably he mangleth and maimeth my words as in other places, so here; He citeth these words as mine, That Christ *as he is eternal God, doth with the Father and the holy Ghost reigne over the Kingdoms of the earth, &c. and this power was given &c.* It is not fair nor just dealing to change a mans words in a citation, especially when the change is materiall. Now here are divers changes in this passage. This one onely I take notice of, I said not *as he is eternal God,* but *as he is the eternal Sonne of God*, and all along in that Question I spake of the Son of God, not *essentially*, but *personally*, as he is the Sonne of God, or second person in the Trinity, and so the God head and all the attributes and properties thereof, are communicated to him from the Father by the eternal Generation; and as the Nicene Creed said he is *Deus de Deo*, *Lumen de Lumine*, *God of God*, *Light of Light.* I ask therefore *Mr. Hussey*, What do you mutter here? Speak it out, Doe you hold that Jesus Christ is not onely ἐσωθῶς, but ὑποστατικῶς, not onely *essentially*, but *personally* αὐτόθεος, that he is not onely *ex seipso Deus*, but *ex seipso filius?* If this be the thing you hold, then you oppose me indeed, but so as you fall into a blasphemous heresie, that *Christ* as he is the eternall Sonne of God, hath not all power in in Heaven and in Earth, but onely as he is Mediator, because that power is given to him, and nothing can be given to Christ as he is the eternall Sonne of God, but onely as he is Mediator, by your principles: But if your meaning be no more then this, that Christ considered ἐσωθῶς in respect of the very nature and essence of the God-head, is αὐτόθεος, not *God of God*, but *God of himself*, and that so nothing can be said

said to be given to him: then why have you dealt so uncharitably as to suppose me to be herein opposite unto you; when I plainly spake of the eternal Son of God ὑποστατικῶς in respect of the personality or relation of filiation, or as he is the eternall Son of God, in which sence I yet averre confidently, that all power in heaven and earth may be said to be given to Jesus Christ, as he is the eternal Son of God by eternal generation.

I added, that all power in heaven and earth may be said to be given to Christ as he is the eternal Son of God, in another respect, namely in respect of the declaration thereof at his resurrection. To this Mr. *Hussey* replieth, that to hold *any thing should be given him that should concern his God-head at the time of his resurrection, is more monstrous.* Then hath *Gomarus* and others given a monstrous answer to the Ubiquitaries, yet they clear it by *Augustines* rule, *aliquid dicitur fieri quando incipit patefieri.* Is it any more strange then to say that Christ was begotten that day when he was raised from the dead *Act.* 13. 33. The Son of God had in obedience to his Fathers will, laid aside and relinquished his divine dominion and power when he took upon him the forme of a servant (which I said before, but it seems was not considered by Mr. *Hussey*) now at his resurrection the Father restoreth with advantage that formerly relinquished Soveraignty.

But he addeth, that if *Matt.* 28. 18. be not understood of Christ as Mediator, *then he had no authority as Mediator to send his Apostles*: for it followeth *Go ye therefore and preach*: *from this authority here spoken of, is the authority to preach the Gospel.*

Answ. Not to stand upon the want of the particle οὖν *therefore*, in diverse Greek coppies: I admit of the cohesion and dependance of the words, thus. Christ being to give a commission to the Apostles to go and preach the Gospel to all Nations, he first anticipateth a great objection, which might arise in the Apostles minds; They might think, how shall we be able to carry the Gospel through the Nations? We shall have all the powers of the world against us. To remove this fear, he said, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*, as if he had said, Do you beleeve that I who send you out, am the Son of the li-

ving God? Then know assuredly, that my divine power and soveraignty shall be for you, and I will so over-rule all the Kings and Potentates and States of the World, as may be most for my glory and your good; fear not therefore, but go and preach to all Nations.

And so much of that Text *Matth.* 28. 18. *Salmeron* upon the place draws from it Christs dominion even in temporall things (as Mr. *Hussey* doth) and thence he deriveth the temporall power of the Pope as Christs Vicar over the Kings and Kingdoms of the World. So *Suarez in tertiam partem Thomæ disp.* 48. *sect.* 2 *Gamachæus in tertiam partem Thomæ, Quæst.* 22. yet some of the Papists themselves are ashamed to defend Christs dominion in temporall things (except as God onely) it appeareth to them so far contrary to other Scriptures.

Bellarmine himself *lib.* 5. *de Pont. Rom. cap.* 4. confesseth that Christ as he did not execute any Temporall dominion, so he neither had nor received such power and authority: thereupon he inferreth that the Pope whom he calleth Christs Vicar and Representee on earth, hath not any Temporal dominion directly, but indirectly, and *in ordine ad spiritualia.* I appeal also to *Salmeron* in another place where he speaks more soundly *Tom.* 4. *part'* 3. *Tract.* 4. pag. 413. he proves from *John* 18. 36. and *Luke* 12. 14. that Christ had not nor received not any temporall power, and thence inferreth, *Cum ergo Christus hujusmodi potestatem non habuerit, nec Petro illam tradidit.*

The eigth argument shall be that which Mr. *Coleman* did draw from 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. to prove that Christ hath placed in his Church Magistrates or civil Governments. Hereunto I had made four answers. Mr. *Hussey* passeth two of them, which he is pleased to esteem *trifles not worth answer.* Now the *Gamaliel* speaks *è cathedra.* The other two he offereth to confute, pag. 28, 29, 30, 31. First, whereas I said that if by Governments in that place be understood civil Magistrates, yet the Text saith not that Christ hath placed them. *Then* saith Mr. *Hussey à fortiori you disclaim by that means any Government in this place as Officers under Christ.* No Sir, this reasoning is *à baculo ad angulum.* I hold Church-Officers and Church-government to be under Christ, and under him as Mediator, and

King

King of the Church, and am ready to prove it against any that will denie it: But upon supposition, that civil Government is meant in that Text, (which I utterly deny) I had reason to call the affirmer to his proper task, to prove from that Text, that Christ as Mediator hath placed civil Government or Magistracie in his Church. This was the point it was brought for, and still I call to make good that proof, for I denie it. It seemes Mr. *Hussey* finds himself puzzled to make it out, and therefore he saith, *if Mr. Coleman will be ruled by me. So as* Mr. Gilespie *will not urge this for constitution of Church-Governments, he shall let it goe.* But if it be a truth, Sir you ought to buy it, and not sell it: For my part I dare make no bargain of Scripture.

My next answer was, that *the Apostle speaks of such Governours, as the Church had at that time; but at that time the Church had no Godly nor Christian Magistrates.* Mr. *Hussey* answereth that it cannot be proved *that the Apostle speaketh of such Officers as were in the Church in his time onely.* He addeth, *I shall urge some few argaments to the contrary.* To the contrary of what? I did not say that the Apostle speaketh of such Officers as were in the Church in his time onely: but that the Church at that time had all those Officers whom the Apostle speaketh of. One would think that he who censureth others so much for want of skill in disputations, should not so far mistake his mark. But we know what he would have said though he hath not hit it. Let us hear his arguments. First, he tells us that the word ἔθετο will signifie *proposuit* or *decrevit*, so that where we read *God hath set in the Church*, it may be read *God hath appointed to his Church*, so to take in those Governments which should afterward by Gods appointment come to the Church. He clears it by *John* 15. 16. *Act.* 19. 21. *Answ.* Then the Apostle saith no more to the *Corinthians*, then might have been said to the old world before the flood, for if the meaning be that God hath ordained and purposed, all this Text had been true, if delivered *in terminis terminantibus*, to the old World, *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, &c.* 2. The context sheweth that the Apostle speaketh onely of such administrations, as the Church had at that time, for all this is spoken in reference to the pre-

venting of a Schisme in the Church of *Corinth*, and that every member of that body might discharge its owne proper function without usurping anothers. 3. He confuteth himself, for he addeth, *This cannot be a Catalogue of such Officers as are at all times necessary to the Church, for then Apostles might not be mentioned.* Therefore it must be said, that ἔθετο in this place is *posuit* or *collocavit* (according to the more usuall signification of τίθημι) and doth relate to that present time, as well as *Act.* 20. 28. *The holy Ghost hath made or set you overseers* ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους: In like manner here *God hath set* (or *placed*) *in the Church*, and so it will agree both to ordinary and extraordinary officers. But if ἔθετο be *decrevit*, then it will referre the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, miracles, to the future estate of the Church, as if they were ordinary Officers to continue in the Church. 4. When ἔθετο signifieth *decrevit*, then the thing is not mentioned, as having an actuall present existence, but a futurition; so that when he takes him to the *decrevit*, he quits the *posuit*, and by that means one cannot prove from that Text, that the Church at that time had any of these Officers there enumerated: ἔθετο relates to all that follows, and either it must be *posuit* to them all, or to none of them.

5. If he had intended to expresse Gods decree or purpose to give unto his Church certain Officers, he would not have said καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *and God hath decreed some in the Church.* Which could make no perfect sence except some other thing were added. Mr. *Hussey* might as well expound *Act.* 5. 18. ἔθεντο αὐτὸς ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ, thus, *and they decreed them in the common prison.* Mr. *Hussey* would render the Text thus, *he hath appointed to his Church*: If the Text had said ἔθετο τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ he might have rendred it so, but when the Text saith ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, he must not render it *to the Church*, but *in the Church*, as *Act.* 19. 21. ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *Paul purposed in the Spirit*: the purpose was not to the Spirit, but in the Spirit.

The second Argument whereby he impugneth that which I said is this, *at that time there were workers of miracles which did supply the defect of civil Magistrates.* And here he insisteth a while to tell us that *thus much a National Covenant and civil*

Magistrate

Magistrate may require of the people, that they will attend upon the means out of natural principles, which at that time miracles caused men to attend upon. But *quid hæc ad Rhombum?* How comes this home to that which he undertook to prove? And if it did, I must say that the civil Magistrate is but little, and a National Covenant far lesse beholding to him. And if the workers of miracles did at that time supply the defect of civil Magistrates (I suppose he should have said Christian Magistrates) then he must draw Christian Magistracy to come in succession not so much to the civil Magistracy in the Apostles times (which yet was true Magistracy) as to the miracles mentioned in the Text, and so bring in the Christian Magistrate upon the ceasing of miracles. A fine plea indeed for Christian Magistracie.

His third Argument goeth thus, We have in the Text first, second, and third; when the Apostle speaks of these which might be liable to present view, but then he breaks off with ἔπειτα, *after that miracles*, which lasted somewhat longer then the Apostles and Prophets; and last we have εἶτα, and these may be ordinary gifts, and this εἶτα relates to helps, Governments: that *Calvin* thinks the helps *were some Officers the Church hath lost: But being put both in one case without any conjunction copulative, why they may not* (I beleeve he would have said, *why may they not?* for the sence can be no other) *belong both to one thing, and this εἶτα may not have some influence upon the times and after age. Answ.* If this be his manner, we shall not much fear the dint of his Arguments, when it comes to the Schooles, which he calls for. What a great matter is made of meer nothing? First, he offereth violence to the Text, because if εἶτα note posteriority of time, and ordinary gifts, then ἔπειτα, which is compounded from εἶτα must much rather note the same thing, and so we shall have not onely gifts of healing, but miracles too, ordinary and continuing administrations in the Church. Next he offereth violence to the Greek language: for when εἶτα and ἔπειτα signifie posteriority, not onely in the enumeration, but in the time of existence, then the one must needs signifie a pre-existence, and the other a post-existence, they cannot be contemporary from their beginnings; yet Mr. *Hussey* will needs

have ἔπειτα before miracles, and again εἶτα before gifts of healing, and diversities of tongues, to signifie posteriority of time, though he cannot say that gifts of healing and diversities of tongues were not contemporary but posterior in time to miracles, And further observe that when the Text runs in this order, *first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, &c.* Mr. *Hussey* will make this the sence, that there were Apostles before prophets, there were Prophets before teachers, there were Teachers before miracles, there were miracles before gifts of healings, &c. and *vice versa*, there were no gifts of healings till after there had been miracles, no miracles till after there had been Teachers in the Church, &c. even as *Mark.* 4. 28. πρῶτον *first the blade*, εἶτα *then the ear*, εἶτα *after that the ful corn in the ear*: the blade hath an existence before the eare, the eare before the full corne. So that taking εἶτα and ἔπειτα in his sence, he must either make out distinctly the order of time, or else confesse he would make the Apostle speak as never Grecian in the world spake, or lastly be content to understand the Apostles words of the order of enumeration. If the word μετέπειτα had been in the Text, that had indeed carried it to posteriority of time as *Heb.* 12. 17. but εἶτα (though sometime it signifieth posteriority of time, yet) in this place having reference to such antecedents and consequents cannot bear his sence. I see it were no ill sport to examine his quint Arguments if a man had but so much leisure.

(f) Calv. in 1 Cor. 12. 28. *Aut certe tam munus quam domum olim fuit, quod nobis hodie est incognitum: aut ad diaconiam pertinet, hoc est curam pauperum. Atque hoc secundum mihi magis arridet.*

Thirdly, He offereth violence to *Calvin*, for (f) *Calvin* saith that these helps mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. were either an ancient gift and office unknown to us now, or it belongs to Deaconship, that is, the care of the poor. And this second (saith he) rather pleaseth me. *Qua fide* then, could Mr. *Hussey* affirm that *Calvin thinks they were some Officers that the Church hath lost.*

Fourthly, Whereas he thinks helps, governments, to belong both to one thing, there was some such thing once foisted into the English Bibles: ἀντιλήψεις, κυβερνήσεις, was read thus, *helps in Governments*: but afterwards the Prelats themselves were ashamed of it, and so it was printed according to the Greek distinctly, *helps, Govirnments.* The Syriack addeth a copulative, and readeth thus, *and helpers, and Governors*, so making

making them distinct officers in the Church. Neither is it any unusual thing in the Greek, to put together Nouns in the same case without any conjunction copulative, when the things themselves so expressed are most different, as *Matth.* 15, 19. *Gal.* 5. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. *Rom.* 1. 29, 30. 31.

The next thing he brings against me, is from *Ephes.* 4. 11. where there is no ordinary or standing Officer left to us, but the Teacher of the Word: here is neither help nor government but this poor Teacher left alone to edifie the body of Christ, and to perfect the Saints. *Answ.* What Argument is there here? ruling Elders are not mentioned *Ephes.* 4. therefore the Governments mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. are such as the Church had not at that time. There are diverse passages of Christs doctrine, life, and sufferings, which are not mentioned by *Matthew*, yet they are mentioned by *John* or some of the other Evangelists. So if we take the primitive platform right, we must set the whole before us, that which is not in one place is in another place. The Apostle *Eph.* 4. intendeth onely to speak of preaching officers who are appointed for this work of the Ministery, to bring us to unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, that we be not carried about with every wind of Doctrine, v. 12 13, 14. And if the Apostle had intended to enumerate all Church-officers in that place, which were then in the Church, how comes it he doth not mention Deacons which he distinguisheth from Bishops or Elders? 1 *Tim.* 3.

His last Argument is, that in this very place 1 *Cor.* 12. the Apostle, when he doth again enumerate the particulars vers. 29, 30. he leaveth out *helps, Governments*, for which, he saith, he knows no reason, but because there were none such at that time, and the Apostle in that induction was to deal with their experience. This (as many other things which he hath) was before answered to Mr. *Coleman.* I give this plain reason for the omission of these two. The Apostle speaketh to those, who were not well satisfied nor contented with their owne station in the Church, but were aspiring to more eminent gifts, and administrations, *are all Apostles?* saith he, *are all Prophets?* &c. and so he reckoneth out onely those rare and singular gifts, which men did most covet: and for that cause it was neither necessary,

nor

nor had it been agreeable to the scope of the Apostle to have added, *are all helps? are all Governments?* But now he purposely leaveth out these, thereby intimating to the ruling Elders and Deacons of the Church of *Corinth*, that they ought to be contented with their owne station, though they be neither Apostles, nor Prophets. &c.

It remaineth therefore that the Governments in the Church mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. were such Governments as were in the Church at that time, and therefore not to be understood of Christian Magistracy: but of Church-Government distinct from the civil.

The ninth Argument brought to prove that all Government is given to Christ as Mediator, and that the Christian Magistrate holds his office of and under Christ. as the head of Magistracy and Principality, is from *Eph.* 1.21,22,23. This Argument first propounded by Mr. *Coleman*, is prosecuted by Mr. *Hussey* pag. 32, 33. &c. He demurres upon that which I said, that this place maketh more against him then for him; the meaning whereof was no more then this, that this place doth rather afford us an Argument against him, then him against us. Come we to the particulars. My first Reply was, *The Apostle saith not that Christ is given to the Church, as the head of all Principalities and Powers. The Brother saith so, and in saying so he makes Christ a head to those that are not of his body.* This exception Mr. *Hussey* quarrelleth, but when he hath endeavoured to prove from that Text that *Christ* is the head of Principalities: because he that is head of all things, is also head of Principalities: though he will never be able to make it out from that Text, that Christ (as Mediator) is head of all things, but onely, that he who is the Churches head is over all things; *and gave him to be the head over* (not of) *all things to the Church*, saith the Text, which as I told before, the Syriack readeth more plainly thus, *and him who is over all, he gave to be the head to the Church.*) At last he fairly gives over the proof. *It is true* saith he, *disputations do require men to keep close to termes, but in Col.* 2. 10. *ye have the very words, head of all Principality and Power.* In *Col.* 2. 10. Christ as he is the eternall Son of God, is called head of all Principality and power: as we shall see anon: but

Ephes.

Ephes. 1. where the Apostle speaketh of Christs headship, in reference to the Church, and as Mediator, he is not called the head of all Principality and Power. So that I had reason to except against Mr. *Colemans* argument which made that Text *Ephes.* 1. to say what it saith not. Now what saith he to the reason I added, can Christ be a head to them that are not of his body? He tells me the visible Church is not the body of Christ, but onely the faithfull. He might have observed the visible Church consisting of visible Saints, plainly spoken of, as the body of Christ, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. 1 *Cor.* 12, 12. 14 27. I know the visible Church is not all one with the invisible and mystical body of Christ; but he who denyeth the visible Church to be the visible, political, ministerial body of Christ, must also deny the visible Church to be the visible Church; for if a Church, then certainly the body of Christ, at least visibly.

The next thing which I did replie, was in explanation of the Text, which was to this sence. He that is the Churches head, is over all, both as he is the Sonne of God, or as the Apostle saith *Rom.* 9. 5. *God over all, blessed for ever*, yea even as man he is over or above all creatures, being exalted to a higher degree of glory, majesty, and dignity, then man or Angel ever was, or shall be: but neither his divine omnipotency, nor the height of glory and honour which as man he is exalted to, nor both these together in the Mediator and Head of the Church, omnipotency and exaltation to glory, can prove that (as Mediator) he exerciseth his Kingly office over all Principalities and Powers, and that they hold of and under him as Mediator. Mr. *Hussey* replieth that the Text makes Christ over or above Principalities and Powers, not onely in dignity and honour, but as King or Head of them, and that thus we must understand the comparison, that he *is above Principality in Principality, Power in Power, Might in Might, Dominion in Dominion.* This is nothing but a begging of what is in Question: That the Power and Dominion of the civil Magistrate, is eminently in Christ as Mediator, and from him (so considered) derived to the Magistrate, is that which I deny can be proved from that Text; and lo when he comes to the point of proba-

tion, he supposeth what he had to prove. My exposition of the Text made good sence; For as an earthly King is exalted to have more power and more glory, then those not onely of his Subjects, but of another State or Kingdom to whom he is not King; so the Mediator and King of the Church is exalted to power and glory far above all Principality and Power, but is not therefore Head or King or Governor to all Principality and Power, as Mediator. And as my exposition makes good sence of the Text, his makes very bad sence of it. For if Christ as Mediator be head and King of all Principalities, powers, and Dominions, then he is, as Mediator, head and King of Heathenish and Turkish Principality, Power, might, and Dominion; and when the Apostle wrote this to the *Ephesians*, it must be granted (according to Mr. *Hussys* glosse) that Christ as Mediator was head and King of the Romane Emperour, and that *Cæsar* held his office of and under Christ as Mediator: for if head of all Principality, how shall they except any?

I further brought severall reasons from the Text it self. The first was this, *The honour and dignity of Jesus Christ there Spoken of, hath place not onely in this world, but in that which is to come (vers. 21.) But the Kingdom and Government which is given to Christ as Mediator, shall not continue in the World to come.* Mr. *Hussey* answereth *pag.* 41. this is *Ignoratio elenchi*, it followeth not, *that which belongeth to him in reference to the World to come, belongeth not to him as Mediator, therefore that Government that is given to him in reference to this World, is not given to him as Mediator.* But still he beggs what is in Question, and divideth asunder what the Text coupleth together, *not onely in this World, but also in that which is to come*: here is a rising and heightning, but no contradistinction, nothing here of one exaltation in reference to the World to come, another in reference to this World: but that exaltation of Christ above every name that is named, (which this Text speaks of) beginnes in this World, and shall continue in the World to come. *Calvin. in Eph.* 1. 21. *Seculi autem futuri disertam facit mentionem, ut significet non temporalem esse Christi excellentiam, sed æternam. He makes expresse mention of the World to come, that he may signifie Christs excellency not to be temporal, but eternal.* This doth well agree.

agree to the dignity, excellency, glory, and honour of Christ, but it cannot be said that Christ shall for ever continue in his Kingly Office as Mediator.

The second reason which I fetcht from the Text, was from vers. 22. *He hath put all things under his feet*; that is, all things except the Church, saith *Zanchius*. But all things are not yet put under his feet, except in respect of Gods decree; It is not yet done actually. *Heb.* 2. 8. Now Christ reignes as Mediator before all things be put under his feet, not after all things are put under his feet, which is clear 1 *Cor.* 15. 25. *Act.* 2. 34, 35. Mr. *Hussey* reply *pag.* 41. 42. saith, that the Church is not here to be excepted, but Church and all is here put under Christs feet, which he proveth by *Heb.* 2. 8. *He left nothing that is not put under him.* But this cannot be understood to be actually done; for the next words say, *But now we see not yet all things put under him*: and if not done actually, but in respect of Gods decree and fore-knowledge, (according to the sence I gave out of *Hierome* on *Eph.* 1. 22.) how can it strengthen him in this particular? *We see not yet.* This *yet* shall not expire till the end, when Christ shall put down all authority and power. And now when it is said *He hath put all things under his feet. Ephes.* 1. 22. that the Church is not meant to be comprehended, but to be excepted in that place as *Zanchius* saith, may thus appear; the Apostle distinguisheth the *all things* from the *Church*, and calls the Church the body of Christ, and him the head to that body, but the *all things* are put under Christs feet (his body is not under his feet, but under the head) and he over all things: for so runs the Text, *and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body.*

And whereas Mr. *Hussey* distinguisheth between Christs putting all his enemies under his feet, 1 *Cor.* 15. 25. and the Fathers putting all things under his feet, *Ibid. vers.* 27. and maketh this latter to be an actual putting under him of friends, foes, Church and all, whence it seems he would have it to follow, that Christ reignes as Mediator, even after all things are put under his feet. He is herein easily confuted from *Heb.* 2. 8. Where God the Father his putting all things under Christs

feet, is plainly declared to be a thing to come, and not yet actually done.

The next reason which I gave out of the Text was from those words, *And gave him to be the head over all things to the Church*; Christs headship and his Government as Mediator, are commensurable. *Christ is a head to none but to his Church.* These words of mine Mr. *Hussey* changeth thus: *he is head over none saith Mr.* Gilespie, *but his Church*, and then he addeth, *Is this to argue out of Scripture, or rather to deny and outface the Scripture? the Scripture saith, he is over all.* See what unconscionable impudent boldnesse this is, to cite my words (yea in a different character too, that his Reader may beleeve it the better) and yet to change not onely my words, but my meaning. I purposely kept my self to the Text, that Christ is a head to none but to his Church, yet he that is the Churches head is over all things. And since Mr. *Hussey* will needs hold that Christ as Mediator is head of all things (which the Text saith not) what were the consequence hereof? The Text saith ὑπὲρ πάντα *over all things*, not over all persons onely: So *Heb.* 2 7,8. compared with *Psal.* 8. 6,7. Whence it followes by Mr. *Hussey's* principles (which I tremble to mention) that Christ as Mediator is Head and King not onely of men, but of sheep, oxen, fowles, and fishes. Behold how dangerous it is for men to be wise above that which is written.

The last reason which I bronght from the last verse, was this, The Church is there called Christs fulnesse in reference to his Headship. This Mr. *Hussey* saith, seemeth to come tolerably from the Text; but the next words, *that which makes him full and compleat so farre as he is a Head or King*: he calls a fallacy, *How commeth this Word King in here?* saith he; First here he yeelds that the Church makes Christ full and compleat so farre as he is a Head, whence it followeth that as Mediator he is onely the Churches head, and there is no other body of Christ but the Church; for if the Church be his fulnesse, his compleat body, there can be no other body of Christ. Doth not this destroy what he hath been arguing for, that *Christ* as Mediator is head of all Principality and Power? And for the word *King*, it may well come in where *Head* commeth: for is not *Christs* King-

Kingdom as Mediator, commensurable with his Headship as Mediator? Is he as Mediator King to any to whom he is not Head? Surely this very answer as it is his last, so it really yeeldeth the cause.

The tenth objection is that which I my self moved to prevent my Antagonists. Christ is called *the Head of all Principality and Power*, *Col.* 2. 10.

To this I answered out of *Bullinger*, *Gualther*, and *Tossanus*; the scope and meaning of the Apostle, is to shew that Christ is true God, and therefore we must not understand the Apostle to speak of Christs headship as he is Mediator, but as he is the natural and eternal Sonne of God. *Mr. Hussey* pag. 34. thinks it is no good consequence, the Apostle speaks not of Christ as Mediator, because he speaks of him as true God, *Is not Christ* saith he, *true God as Mediator?* I answer, As Mediator he is God-man. But he must remember the Argument is urged to prove the subordination of all Principality and power to Jesus Christ as Mediator. Now let him prove that the Apostle speaketh there of Christ as Mediator; I say he speaketh of Christ as God; He cannot conclude against what I said, except he argue thus, that which Christ is as God, he is as Mediator; which is false, as I have made it appear else-where. Well: but *Mr. Hussey* proves from the Text that Christ is there spoken of as Mediator. *vers.* 9, 10. For *in him dwelleth the fulnesse of the God-head bodily, and ye are compleat in him which is the head of all Principality and power.* But he draweth no argument from the words. Neither is there any thing in them which maketh against me. The Apostle shews them, that the man Jesus Christ is also true God, equal and consubstantial with the Father; for the very fulnesse of the God-head is in him, that is, he is fully and compleatly God, so that saith *Calvin*, they who desire something more then Christ, must desire something more then God. Wherefore our Writers make the right use of this place when they bring it against the Socinians, to prove the God-head of Christ. See *Christian. Becman. exercit. 9.* This fulnesse of the God-head is in Christ bodily, that is, either *personally*, to distinguish him from the holy men of God, who were inspired by the holy Ghost; or *substantially*, as others take

take the Word, in opposition to the Tabernacle and Temple in which the God-head was *typically*. *Ye are compleat in him*, saith the Apostle, meaning because he is compleatly God, so that we need not invocate or worship Angels, as if we were not compleat in Christ. *Mr. Hussey* admitteth what I said concerning the scope of the place, to teach the *Colossians* not to worship Angels, because servants: *But* saith he, *may they not worship Christ as Mediator? yes doubtlesse they may.* No doubt he that is Mediator must be worshipped, because he is God; Christ God-man is the object of divine adoration, and his God-head is the cause of that adoration; but whether he is to be worshipped because he is Mediator, or under this formall consideration as Mediator; and whether the Mediator ought to be therefore adored with divine adoration, because he is Mediator, is *res altioris indaginis.* If *Mr. Hussey* please to read and consider what divers School-men have said upon that point, as *Aquinas tertia part. quæst. 25. art. 1. & 2. Alex. Alensis Sum. Theol. part. 3. quæst. 30. membr. 2. Suarez in tertiam part. Thomæ Disp. 53. sect. 1. Valentia Comment. in Tho. Tom. 4. Disp. 1. quæst. 24. punct. 1. Tannerus Theol. Scholast. Tom. 4. Disp. 1. quæst. 7. Dub. 7.* But much more if he please to read *Disputatio de adoratione Christi, habita inter Faustum Socinum & Christianum Francken*: and above all Dr. *Voetius select. disput. ex poster. part. Theol. Disp. 14. An Christus qua Mediator sit adorandus?* Then I beleeve he will be more wary and cautious what he holds concerning that Question. But I must not be ledd out of my way to multiply Questions unnecessarily: All that I said was, that the Apostle teacheth the *Colossians*, not to worship Angels, because they are servants, but Christ the Son of the living God, who is the Head and Lord of Angels; and in that place the Apostle speaketh of the honour which is due to Christ as God; and if we would know in what sence the Apostle calls Christ the Head of all Principality and Power, see how he expounds himself *Coloss. 1. 15, 16, 17.* speaking of the God-head of Jesus Christ. Finally, If *Mr. Hussey* will prove any thing from *Coloss. 2. 10.* against us, he must prove that those words *which is the head of all Principality and power*, are meant in reference not onely to the Angels, but to Civil Magistrates; that

and next, that they are meant of Christ, not onely as God, but as Mediator. Both which he hath to prove, for they are not yet proved.

CHAP. VII.

Arguments for the Negative of that Question formerly propounded.

MY Arguments against the derivation of Magistracy from Jesus Christ as Mediator, and against the Magistrates holding of his office of and under Christ as Mediator, are these.

First, This Doctrine doth evacuate and nullifie the civil Authority and Government of all Heathen or Pagan Magistrats; for which way was the authority of Government derived from Christ, and from him as Mediator, to a Pagan Magistrate or Emperour? If he hath not his power from Christ as Mediator, then he is but an usurper, and hath no just title to reign, according to their Principles which hold that all government, even civil, is given to Christ, and to him as Mediator. *Mr. Hussey* forsooth doth learnedly yeeld the argument, and answereth pag. 20. that not onely it is a sin to be a Heathen, but the government of a Heathen is sinfull and unlawfull, for which he gives this reason, *Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.* He might as well conclude, in that sence, that the best vertues of the Heathen were sin, because not of faith, that is, *accidentally* sin, in respect of the end, or manner of doing, not *materially*, or in their own nature. Upon the same reason he must conclude, that the government of a Christian Magistrate is unlawfull, if it be not of faith, as oftimes it is not, through the blindnesse and corruption of mens hearts who govern. But whether is the

the government of a Heathen Magistrate *per se*, *simpliciter*, & *ex natura sua*, unlawful and sinful? Whether hath he any just right or title to Government and Magistracy? If his title to civil Magistracie be just, and if his government be in it self materially and substantially lawful, then he must have a Commission from Christ, and from him as Mediator: This I suppose cannot be *Mr. Hussey's* sence, for he hath not answered one syllable to the argument, tending that way. But if the Government of an Heathen Magistrate be in it self materially, substantially, and in the nature of the tenure, sinfull and unlawfull, so that as long as he remains an Heathen, he hath no reall right, nor true title to Government, but onely a pretended and usurped title (which must needs be *Mr. Hussey's* sence, if he hath answered any thing at all to my Argument) then he goeth crosse not onely to the holy men of God in the old Testament who honoured Heathen Princes, and were subject to them as to lawful Magistrates; but also to the doctrine of Jesus Christ, who taught his Disciples to give unto Cæsar what is Cæsars; and of the Apostles who in their time exhorted the Churches to be subject even to Heathen Magistrates (for they had no other at that time) to obey them, to pray for them. *Rom.* 13. *Titus* 3. 1. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. 17. It is justly condemned as one of the errors of the Anabaptists, that an heathen Magistrate is not to be acknowledged as a lawfull Magistrate, or as being from God. See *Gerhard loc. com. Tom.* 6. *Pag.* 498. 499. *P. Hinkelmannus de Anabaptismo disp.* 13. *cap.* 1. The Scriptures now cited are so clear, that when *Mr. Hussey* saith of the heathen Magistrate, *Let Baal plead for himself*, he might as well have said, that Christ and his Apostles pleaded for Baal. They that plead for the authority of an heathen Magistrate do not plead for Baal, but for God, and for his ordinance: for *the powers that be, are ordained of God*, saith *Paul* speaking even of the heathen Magistrates, *Rom.* 13. 1. But what will *Mr. Hussey* say, if his great master *Erastus* be found a pleader for Baal, as much as I am? *Confirm. Thes. lib.* 3. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 184. speaking of the heathen and unbeleeving Magistrates, before whom the *Corinthians* went to law one against another, he saith, *An non est impius quoque Magistratus à Deo præpositus, ut*

ut subjectos quoslibet ab injuria & vi tueatur? Is not the ungodly Magistrate also preferred by God, that he may defend any of his Subjects from injury and violence. Yea the Scriptures afore touched are so clear in this point, that *Gamachæus in primam secundæ Quæst. 4. & 5. cap. 33.* though he hold that by humane and Ecclesiastical right, Pagan Princes lose their dominion and authority over their Subjects, when their Subjects turne Christians; yet he acknowledgeth that they still retain their former Jurisdiction over those Subjects, by the Law of God and nature. Surely one might as well say, that heathen Parents are unlawful, and heathen masters are unlawful, and heathen husbands are unlawful; (all which were contrary to the Word of God) as to say that heathen Magistrates are unlawful. Take the instance in Parents, for all lawful Magistrates are fathers by the fifth Commandement. Doth the paternity of a heathen father *differre specie*, from the paternity of a Christian father? are they not both lawful parents, being made such by God and nature? are not their children bound to honour them, and be subject to them, and obey them in things lawful? The paternity is the same *in se*, but different *modaliter* that I may borrow a distinction from *Mr. Hussey*. The Christian father is sanctified, and qualified to do service to Jesus Christ, as a father, in educating his children Christianly, which an heathen father can not do. So the heathen Magistrate, and the Christian Magistrate are both lawful Magistrates, being made such by God and nature, or by election of people: they are both of them to be honoured, submitted unto, and obeyed, they are both of them the ministers of God for good to their people: their power is the same *in actu signato*, though not *in actu exercito*. The heathen Magistrate may do and ought to do what the Christian Magistrate doth; but the Christian Magistrate is fitted, qualified, enabled, and sanctified to glorifie and serve Jesus Christ, as a Magistrate, which the heathen Magistrate is not.

Secondly, They that hold the derivation of Magistracy to be from Jesus Christ, and that it is held of and under him as Mediator, must either shew from Scripture that Jesus Christ as Mediator hath given a commission of Vicegerentship or Deputyship to the Christian Magistrate, or otherwise acknow-

ledge, that they have given the most dangerous and deadly wound, even to Christian Magistracy it self, which ever before it received. *Mr. Hussey* pag. 20. answereth, *I conceive he* (the Christian Magistrate) *hath a Commission from Christ*: but when he should prove it (which my argument calld for) here he is at a losse. He citeth *Psal.* 72. 11. *All Kings shall fall downe before him, all Nations shall serve him. Isa.* 60. 12. *That Nation and Kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish.* I hope indeed
" there is a time comming when all Kings shall fall down before
" Jesus Christ, and all Nations shall serve him, and that will make an end of the Erastian controversie. But I pray, do all that serve Jesus Christ, hold their office of and under Christ, as Mediator, and as his Vicegerents? then the poorest servant that fears God shall be a Vicegerent of Jesus Christ, as Mediator, and shall have a commission from Christ to that effect, for every godly servant doth not serve his master onely, but Christ, *Eph.* 6. 5, 6, 7. Again, if those who shall perish because they serve not Christ, be his Deputies and Vicegerents; then the wickedest persecuters in the World shall have a commission of Vicegerentship from Jesus Christ. Well, let the Christian Magistrate animadvert, whether these men have done any thankworthy service to Magistracy, who will needs have it to hold of and under Christ as Mediator, and by a commission of Vicegerentship from him; and when they are put to it, to produce that commission, they prove no more then agreeth either to the meanest Christian, or to the wickedest persecuter. The Ministery hath a clear undeniable commission from Christ as Mediator (even our opposites themselves being Judges) *Matth.* 16. 19. and 28. 19. 20. *John* 20. 21, 22, 23. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. *Eph.* 4. 11. 12. *Act.* 20. 28. *Tit.* 1. 5. I say therefore again, let them also shew from Scripture a commission from Jesus Christ constituting Christian Magistrates to be his Vicegerents as he is Mediator, and to hold their office of and under him as Mediator: which if they cannot shew, they have done a greater disservice to the Christian Magistrate, then they can easily repair or amend: We are sure the lawful Magistrate (whether Heathen or Christian) is Gods Vicegerent, and that is a safe holding of his office. But our opposites shall never prove, that any civil

Magi-

Magistrate (though Christian and godly) is the Vicegerent of Jesus Christ as Mediator. And in seeking to prove it, I am perswaded they shall but discover their own weakness, and shall also weaken the Magistrates authority more then they can strengthen it.

Thirdly, The Scripture intimateth this difference between Ministery and Magistracy; that the work of the Ministery and the administrations thereof are performed in the name of Jesus Christ as Mediator and King of the Church: the work of Magistracy not so, except we adde to the Word of God; they who will do any thing in the Name of Jesus Christ as Mediator, and cannot find any Scripture which can warrant their so doing, are lyars, and the truth is not in them. Now let our opposites shew (if they can) where they find in Scripture, that the Christian Magistrate is to rule in the name of Christ, to judge in the name of Christ, to make laws in the name of Christ, to make war or peace in the name of Christ, to punish evil doers with the Temporal Sword in the name of Christ. Of the Ministery I did shew, that in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ we do assemble our selves together, *Matth.* 18. 20. in his name doe we preach, *Luk.* 24. 47. *Act.* 4. 17, 18. and 5. 28 44. and 9. 27. In his name do we baptize, *Act.* 2. 38. and 8. 16. and 19. 5. In his name do we excommunicate, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. These my proofs from Scripture *Mr. Hussey* pag. 21. professeth he will examine according to laws of disputation. I know none transgresseth those laws more than himself, and even in this very place where he professeth to keep close to lawes of disputation: my first proof from *Matth.* 18. 20. he quarrelleth upon a meer mistake of his owne. He saith I brought it to prove the institution of Church-officers, and that to prove it, I do appropriate the meeting in the name of hCrist to Church-Officers, and thereupon he tells us the Text saith not, that none shall gather together in my name but Church-Officers. Are these *Mr. Hussey's* lawes of disputation? He had need to be a better disputer who calls others to School. I did not speak here of the Institution of Church-Officers, and far lesse did I exclude all others from meeting in the name of Christ; Church-officers assemble in the name of Christ with the Church; and when they assemble

in the name of Christ apart, and without the multitude, will it follow that because they meet in the name of Christ therefore none but they meet in the name of Christ. Well, let *Mr. Hussey* try all his Logick in this consequence, it will not do. The sixth general Councell, *Actione* 17. apply unto their owne œcumenicall Assembly, that promise of Christ *Matth.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, &c.* Protestant Writers both in their Commentaries, and Polemick Writings, do usually apply the same Text to Synods and Councells: For instance, *Calvin. Instit, lib. 4. cap. 9. sect.* 1. & 2. holds that the authority of Councells dependeth upon that promise of Christ, *Where two or three are met together in my name, &c.* That which went before, carries it to Assemblies for acts of discipline, as being principally intended in that place. The promise ver. 20. is general, belonging to all Church Assemblies: yet in that place it is applyed to Assemblies of Church-Officers for discipline. But neither need I go so far in this present argument; for when Church-Officers meet with the Church for the Word, Sacraments, and other parts of Worship, this is in the name of Jesus Christ, without all controversie, and this is enough to justifie all that I brought that Text for; especially there being herein a difference between sacred and civil Assemblies: there is no such promise made to Magistrates Courts of Justice, as to Church Assemblies. That which he citeth out of Dr. *Whittaker* and Bishop *Mortoun* makes nothing against me, neither doth he quote the places, peradventure because he found something in those passages which made against him. *Whittakers* sence is plainly of sacred, and not of civil Assemblies. And for that so much controverted Text *Matth.* 18. 17. *Tell the Church. Whittaker* expoundeth it as we do against the Erastians, *Tell the Pastors and Rulers of the Church. Whittak. de Eccles. quæst.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Dic Ecclesiæ, hoc est Pastoribus & Præfectis Ecclesiæ.*

As for preaching, Mr. *Hussey* saith, it is out of question that we preach in the name of Christ. Well: then let him shew such another thing of the Magistrate, as is without controversie done by him in the name of Christ.

But where I added, that in the name of Jesus Christ we baptize

baptize, though I said no more then the Scripture saith, yet he is pleased to object against me. *These places he citeth* saith he, *to prove that we baptize in the Name of Jesus, as exclusively to Father and holy Ghost, (leaving out the words of the commission: Matth. 28. Baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost) for so the state of his question doth require; for he distinguisheth acutely and accurately between Christ as Mediator and second person* (he should have said *as second Person*) *in Trinity, in all this Argument.* And so he concludes that which I had said to be *contrary to the words of the Commission and the practice of all Churches.* What doth he drive at? I cited plain Texts to prove that baptisme is administred in the name of Christ: Either *Mr. Hussey* denyeth that this is done in the name of Christ as Mediator: or he denyeth it not. If he denie it, let him speak it out, and he shall not want an answer. Mean while let him remember that himself pag. 25. saith, that Christ as Mediator did give that commission to the Apostles, *Go Preach and baptize.* If he denie it not, then let him give the like instance for Magistracy and civil Government, to prove it to be managed in the name of Jesus Christ as Mediator, else he must not plead that Magistracy is of the same tenure from Christ as the Ministery. Again, either he admitteth a distinction between Christ as Mediator, and as second person in Trinity, or not. If he doe not, he will infallibly wind himself into a grosse heresie; as namely these two. 1. He must denie that principle which according to the Word of God, all Orthodox Divines hold against the Arrians and Antitrinitarians, that ([t]) Christ as Mediator is subordinate unto, and lesser then the Father; but as second person in the Trinity he is not subordinate unto nor lesser then the Father, nor the Father greater then he, but as such he is equal with the Father in greatnesse, glory, and honour. 2. As *opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt indivisa*, he must also hold that whatsoever Christ as Mediator doth, that also the Father and the holy Ghost doth: but Christ as Mediator did humble himself to the death, offer himself in a sacrifice for sin, maketh intercession for us, *Ergo*, he must conclude the Father doth the same. But if he do admit the distinction as Mediator, and as second person in Trinity, then why doth he so often quarrell it? And in this very

(t) Synop. pur. Theol. Disp. 26. Thes. 29. *Tametsi ob istam mediationem filius Dei minor sit Patre, non propterea ipso minor est quoad Deitatem.*

very place his Argument must drive against that distinction, or against nothing. But how doth the baptizing in the name of Christ as Mediator, agree with the commission to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost? Though this belong not to my Argument, yet I will by the way speak to it. First I say, the Question is of things or actions, not of words. Mr. *Hussey* (it seems) did apprehend my meaning, as if I had intended an expression to be made in the act of baptizing, thus, *I baptize thee in the name of Jesus Christ.* But I spake of the action, not of the expression, even as in the other instance I gave; our assembling together is in the name of Christ, though we do not say *in terminis, We are now assembled in the name of Christ.* In baptisme Christ doth not command us to say, either these words, *I baptize thee in the Name of Christ*; or these words, *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost*: but we are commanded to do the thing, both in the name of Christ as Mediator, and in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost: But in different respects. A minister of Christ doth both preach and baptize in the name of Christ as Mediator, that is *vice Christi*, in Christs stead, and having authority for that effect from Christ as Mediator; for Christ as Mediator gave us our commission to preach and baptize by Mr. *Husseys* confession. So that to preach and baptize ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (which we find both of preaching, *Luk.* 24 47. and of baptizing, *Act.* 2. 38.) comprehendeth a formall commission, power and authority given and derived from Christ, I say not that it comprehendeth no more, but this it doth comprehend. But when Christ biddeth us baptise εἰς τὸ ὄνομα *unto*, or *into*, or *in the name* of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, *Mat.* 28. 19. this doth relate to the end and effect of baptisme, or the good of the baptized (if we understand the words properly) not the authority of the baptizer, as if a formall commission were there given him from the Father, Son, and holy Ghost. So that to baptize one *in* or *unto* the name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, is properly meant both of sealing the parties right and title to the enjoyment of God himself, as their God by covenant, and their intereſt in the love of God, the grace of Christ, and the communion of the holy Ghost; and of dedicating

dicating the party to the knowledge, profession, faith, love, and obedience of God, the Father, Son, and holy Ghost.

I return, The next branch of my Argument was that we excommunicate in the name of Christ 1 *Cor.* 5 5. Mr. *Hussey* pag. 22. saith I make great hast here, *deliver to Sathan* saith he *is not to excommunicate, &c. But grant that it were excommunication, &c. the decree was Pauls, and not the Corinthians.* What is meant by delivering to Sathan, belongs to another debate. Call it an Apostolicall act, or call it an Ecclesiasticall act, or both, yet it was done in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ; the like whereof we find not in Scripture of any act of the civil Magistrate. Why doth he not attend to the drift of the Argument? And as to his exceptions (u) they are no other then Prelats, Papists, and Socinians have made before him, and which are answered long agoe. That the Apostle commandeth to excommunicate the incestuous man, is acknowledged by Mr. *Prynne.* That he who is excommunicated may be truly said to be delivered to Sathan, is undeniable; for he that is cast out of the Church, whose sins are retained, on whom the Kingdom of heaven is shut and locked, whom neither Christ nor his Church doth owne, is delivered to Sathan, who reignes without the Church. That this censure or punishment of excommunication was a Church act, and not an Apostolicall act onely, may thus appear. 1. The Apostle blameth the *Corinthians*, that it was not sooner done; he would not have blamed them, that a miracle was not wrought. 2. He writeth to them, to do it when they were gathered together, not to declare or witnesse what the Apostle had done, but to joyne with him in the authoritative doing of it, *vers.* 4. 5. again he saith to them vers. 7. *Purge out therfore the old leaven.* vers 12. *Doe not ye judge them that are within?* vers. 13. *Put away from among your selves that wicked person.* 3. It was *a censure inflicted by many*, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6 not by the Apostle alone, but *by many.* 4. The Apostle doth not absolve the man, but writeth to them to forgive him, 2 *Cor.* 2. 7. Lastly, the Syriack maketh for us, which runneth thus, vers. 4. *That in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, you all may be gathered together, and I with you in the Spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ*, vers. 5. *That you may deliver him to Sathan. &c.*

(u) Synops. pur. Theol. Disp. 42. Coroll. 4. *An Apostolus Paulus cum hominem incestuosum Satanæ traderet, quicquam peculiare habuerit? Nos contra Socinianos Apostolum Paulum non ex jure sibi peculiari, sed sibi cum omnibus Ecclesiæ Presbyteris communi, incestuosum illum Satanæ tradidisse, colligimus ex* 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. *Mat.* 18. 17. 18.

But

But now at last Mr. *Hussey* comes home, and gives this answer to my third Argument, *A thing may be said to be done in the name of Christ or of God, When men do any thing in confidence that God will assist us: so Psal.* 20 5. *In the name of our God will we set up our banners in confidence God will assist us: Thus I hope the Parliament and other Christians may undertake the businesse in the name of Christ,* &c. Secondly, *In the name of Christ a thing is said to be done, that is done in the authority, room, and place of Christ,* &c. So he pag. 24. seeking a knot in the rush. In the first part of his distinction, he saith nothing to my Argument, neither saith he any more of the Parliament then agreeth to all Christians, the poorest and meanest; for every Christian servant, every Christian Artificer is bound to do whatsoever he doth, in the name of Christ, *Colos.* 3. 17. But what is that to the Argument? Come to the other member of his distinction. The Ministers of Christ do act in the name of Christ: that is, in the authority, room and place of Christ; We are Ambassadors for Christ, and we preach in Christs stead, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. This he doth not nor cannot denie: (which makes good my Argument;) Why did he not shew us the like concerning Magistracy? I suppose he would, if he could: this is the very point which he had to speak to, but hath not done it.

My fourth Argument against the Magistrates holding of his office of, and under, and for Christ, that is, in Christs room and stead as Mediator, shall be that which was drawn from *Luk.* 12. 14. The Jewes were of the same opinion, which Mr. *Coleman* and Mr. *Hussey* have followed, namely, that civil government should be put in the hands of Christ, which they collected from *Jer.* 23. 5. *He shall execute justice and judgement in the earth*; and such other Prophecies by them mis-understood. And hence it was that one said to Christ, *Master, Speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me.* Our Lords answer was, *Man who made me a Judge or a divider over you.* Whatsoever act of authority is done by a Deputy or Vicegerent, as representing his Master and Soveraigne, may be done by the King himself when personally present: If therefore the Magistrate judge civil causes, and divide inheritances,

as

as the Vicegerent of Christ, and of Christ as Mediator, then Christ himself, when present in the dayes of his flesh, had power as Mediator to judge such causes. But this Christ himself plainly denyeth. Let us hear Mr. *Hussey*s answer, pag. 24. (It is the very same with that which *Azorius Instit. mor. part. 2. lib. 4. cap. 19.* (pleading for the Popes Temporall Dominion) answereth concerning the point now in hand) *It doth not follow that because Christ was not a Judge actu exercito, therefore the originall right of Government was not in him: And this Objection may be answered thus, Christ doth not say he was not a Judge, but who made me a Judge? how dost thou know that I am a Judge? And thus Christ in the time of his humiliation did often hide the manifestation of his power.* (x) What greater violence could be offered to the Text? For the Verbe καθίστημι *constituit* is purposely used to deny the power or right, as well as the exercise; and proveth that he was not a Judge *actu signato*, having no such power nor authority given him, it is the same phrase which is used *Act.* 7. 35. τίς σε κατέστησεν, *Who made thee a Ruler and a Judge?* *Moses* was then beginning to do the part of a Ruler and a Judge, *actu exercito*; but they refuse him as having no warrant, power, nor authority, *Act.* 6. 3. the Apostles bid choose seven Deacons, οὓς καταστήσωμεν, *Whom we may appoint* say they *over this businesse*, *Tit.* 1. 5. καὶ καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους: *and ordain Elders in every City*: yet neither can that of the Deacons, nor this of the Elders, be understood otherwise, then of the right, power, and authority given them. See the like *Heb.* 7. 28. *Luk.* 12. 42. *Matth.* 24. 47. The scope therefore of Christs answer was this (as *Aretius* upon the place) *non debeo aliena munia invadere.* I ought not to invade such Offices as belong to others, not to me.

(x) Jo. Brentius Hom. in Luc. Tom. 1. Hom. 106. *Quis me constituit Judicem aut divisorem super vos? hoc est, alia est civilis Magistratus vocatio, alia mea vocatio. Ad illum pertinet ut dijudicet controversias de hæreditatibus, & id genus aliis rebus. Ad me autem pertinet ut doceam Evangelion de remissione peccatorum, & vitæ æterna.*

Ut igitur nollem quod magistratus meum officium temere usurparet, ita & mea interest, ne temere usurpem mihi vocationem magistratus. Observanda doctrina, qua non solum erudimur, quod sit proprium & legitimum officium Christi in hoc externo mundo, verum etiam admonemur exemplo Christi, ne quis alienam vocationem illegitime invadat.

Jo. Winckelmannus in Luk. 12. 14. *Negat se esse politicum Judicem hereiscundæ familiæ, sicut nec adulteram damnat, Joh.* 8. *Ostendit enim esse discrimen inter Politicum magistratum, & munus Ecclesiasticum.*

Some of the Jesuits (as forward as they are to defend the Temporal Power of the Pope as Christs Vicar on earth, yet) cannot shut their eies against the light of this Text, *Who made me a Judge or a divider over you?* But they are forced to acknowledge (y) that Christ denies that he had any right or authority to be a civil Judge. For how can he who is authorized to be a Judge say, *Who made me a Judge?*

(y) Greg. de Valentia comment. Theol. Tom. 4. Disp. 1. Quæst. 22. Punct. 6. Homo, quis me constituit Judicem aut divisorem inter vos? *Quasi diceret: Nemo plane, neque homo, & multo minus Deus. Si enim a Deo haluisset Dominium Jurisdictionis politicæ, multo verius fuisset constitutus Judex politicus, quam si eam Jurisdictionem habuisset ab homine. Et tamen negat omnino se fuisse talem Judicem constitutum. Unde per hoc quod addit,* Quis me constituit Judicem? *&c. Eum remisit ad alium qui haberet eam potestatem, qua ipse careret. See the like in* Bellarmine de Pontif. lib. 5. cap. 4.

The fifth Argument I take from *John* 18. 36. *My Kingdom is not of this World.* The great jealousie and fear which both *Herod* and *Pilate* had of Christ; was, that they understood he was a King. Christ clears himself in this point, his Kingdom was such as they needed not be afraid of, for though it be *in the World*, it is not *of the World*; though it be *here*, it is not *from hence*, it is heterogeneous to Temporal monarchy and civil Government. Mr. *Hussey* pag. 24. tells us, he knows not how those Governments that should be executed by Church-Officers, should savour lesse of the World then the civil Government. For this I remit him to those many and great differences, which I have shewed between the civil and the Ecclesiastical Power. In the mean while my argument stands in force; For if all civil Government were put in Christs hand as he is Mediator, and he to depute and substitute others whom he will under him; then what is there in that answer of his to *Pilate*, which could convincingly answer those mistakes and misapprehensions of the nature of his Kingdom. That which is now taught by Master *Hussey*, is the very thing which *Herod* and *Pilate* were afraid of: but Christ denyeth that which they were afraid of: and vers. 36. is an answer to the Question asked, vers. 33. *Art thou the King of the Jews? My Kingdom is not of this World*, saith he. To the same sence (as *Grotius* upon the place noteth out of *Eusebius*) Christs kinsmen when they were asked concerning his Kingdome, did answer to *Domitian*,

tian, (z) that his Kingdom was not worldly; but heavenly.

(z) ὡς ἡ ἐμὴ βασιλεία οὐ κοσμικὴ μέν ἐδ' ὁπηγεῖο, ἐπεγείνιο δ' οὐ καὶ ἀγγελικὴ τυγχάνει.

Sixthly, I prove the point from *Luke* 17. 20, 21. *And when he was demanded of the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God should come; he answered them and said, The Kingdom of God commeth not with observation. Neither shall they say loe here, or lo there; For behold the Kingdom of God is within you.* By the Kingdom of God is meant in this place the kingdom of the Messiah, as Interpreters do unanimously agree. Both *John Baptist* and Christ himself had preached, that the Kingdom of God was at hand; and the Jews themselves were in expectation of the Messiah to make them free from the Roman yoke, and to restore a temporal or earthly monarchy to Israel. Hereupon they aske when this Kingdom should come. His answer is, *The Kingdom of God commeth not* μετὰ παρατηρήσεως *with observation*, or *outward shew* and pomp, but it is within you, it is spiritual, it belongs to the inward man. But if the Magistrate be Christs Vicegerent, and hold his office of and under Christ as Mediator, and if Christ as Mediator reigne in, through and by the Magistrate, then the Kingdom of the Messiah doth come with observation and pomp, with a crown, a scepter, a sword, and μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, with princely splendor, riches, triumph, such as the Pharisees then, and the Jews now do expect: which saith *Grotius* is the thing that Christ here denieth; For all the outward pomp, observation, splendor, majesty, power, and authority, which a Vicegerent hath, doth principally redound unto his Master and Soveraign: So that by our opposites principles, the Kingdom of Christ must come with observation, because the dominion of the Magistrate (whom they hold to be his Vicegerent) commeth with observation.

Seventhly, That Government and authority which hath a foundation in the law of nature and Nations (yea might and should have had place and been of use, though man had not sinned) cannot be held of and under and managed for Christ as he is Mediator. But Magistracy or civil Government hath a foundation in the law of Nature and Nations (yea might and should have had place and been of use though man had not sinned) *Ergo.* The reason of the proposition, is because the

law of nature and nations, and the law which was written in mans heart in his first creation, doth not flow from Christ as Mediator, but from God as Creator: neither can it be said that Christ as Mediator ruleth and governeth all nations by the law of nature and nations, or that Christ should have reigned as Mediator, though man had not sinned. The Assumption is proved by *Gerhard loc. com. Tom. 6. pag.* 459. 460. 474 In the state of innocency there had been no such use of Magistracy as now there is; for there had been no evil doers to be punished, no unruly persons to be restrained; yet as the wife had been subject to the husband, and the son to the Father, so no doubt there had been an union of diverse families under one head, man being naturally ζῶον πολιτικὸν as *Aristotle* calls him, he is for society and policy, and how can it be imagined that mankind multiplying upon the earth should have been without headship, superiority, order, society, govenment? And what wonder that the law of nature teach all Nations some government: (a) *Hierome* observeth, that nature guideth the very reasonlesse creatures to a kind of Magistracy.

(a) Hier. Rust. co monacho. *Etiam muta animantia & ferarum greges ductores sequuntur suos. In apibus principes sunt.*

Eightly, If the Scripture hold forth the same derivation or origination of Magistracy in the Christian Magistrate and in the heathen Magistrate, then it is not safe to us to hold that the Christian Magistrate holds his office of and under Christ as Mediator. But the Scripture doth hold forth the same derivation or origination of Magistracy in the Christian Magistrate, and in the Heathen Magistrate. *Ergo*, The proposition hath this reason for it, because the Heathen Magistrate doth not hold his office of and under Christ as Mediator; neither doth Mr. *Hussey* herein contradict me: onely he holds the heathen Magistrate and his Government to be unlawful: wherein he is Anabaptistical, and is confuted by my first Argument. As for the Assumption, it is proved from divers Scriptures, and namely these, *Rom.* 13. 1. *the powers that be, are ordained of God*, which is spoken of heathen Magistrates. *Dan.* 2. 37. *Thou O King art a King of Kings, for the God of heaven hath given thee a Kingdom, Power, and Strength, and Glory.* So saith *Daniel* to *Nebuchadnezzar* an Idolatrous and heathen King. See the like *Jer.* 27. 6. *Isa.* 45. 1. God sent his servant the Prophet to anoint *Hazael* King

King over *Syria*; 1 *Kings* 19. 15. Read to this purpose *Augustine de civit. Dei, lib.* 5. *cap.* 21. Where he saith (b) that the same God gave a Kingdom and authority both to the Romans, Assyrians, Persians, Hebrews; and that he who gave the Kingdom to the best Emperors, gave it also to the worst Emperors; yea he that gave it to *Constantine* a Christian, did also give it saith he, to *Julian* the apostate. *Tertullian Apol: cap.* 30. speaking of the heathen Emperors of that time, saith that they were from God, *à quo sunt secundi, post quem primi ante omnes*, that he who had made them men, did also make them Emperors, and give them their power. *Ibid. cap.* 33. *Ut meritò dixerim noster est magis* Cæsar, *ut a nostro Deo constitutus*: *so that I may justly say*, Cæsar *is rather ours, as being placed by our God*: saith he, speaking to the Pagans in the behalf of Christians. Wherefore though there be huge and vast differences between the Christian Magistrate and the heathen Magistrate, the former excelling the latter, as much as light doth darkness, yet in this point of the derivation and tenure of Magistracy; they both are equally interested, and the Scripture sheweth no difference, as to that point.

(b) *Qui Mario, ipse Caio Cæsari: qui Augusto, ipse & Neroni; qui Vespasianis vel patri vel filio, suavissimis Imperatoribus, ipse & Domitiano crudelissimo. Et ne per singulos ire necesse sit, qui Constantino Christiano, ipse Apostatæ Juliano.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Power and Privi'edge of the Magistrate in things and causes Ecclesiastical; what it is not, and what it is.

THe new notion that the Christian Magistrate is a Church-officer, and Magistracy an Ecclesiastical as well as a civil administration, calls to mind that of the Wise-man; *Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See this is new? it hath been already of old time which was before us.* *Plato* in his *Politicus* (a little after the middle of that book) tells me, that the Kings of *Egypt* were also Priests, and that in many Cities of the Grecians, the supream Magistrate had the administration of the holy things. Notwithstanding even in this particular there still appeareth some new thing under the Sun. For *Plato* tells me again *Epist.* 8. that those supreme Magistrates who were Priests, might not be present nor joyne in criminall nor capitall judgements, lest they (being Priests) should be defiled. If you look after some other President for the union of civil and ecclesiastical Government, secular and spirituall administrations, in one and the same person or persons, perhaps it were not hard to find such presidents, as our opposites will be ashamed to owne.

I am sure Heathens themselves have known the difference between the office of Priests and the office of Magistrates. *Aristotle*

ſtotle de Repub. lib. 4. *cap.* 15. ſpeaking of Prieſts ſaith, τοῦτο γὰρ ἕτερον πρὸς τὰς πολιτικὰς ἀρχάς. *For this is another thing then civil Magiſtrates.* He had ſaid before, πολλῶν γὰρ ἐπιστατῶν ἡ πολιτικὴ κοινωνία δεῖται *For a civil ſociety hath need of many Rulers*: but every ἐπιστάτης who is made by election or lot, is not a civil Magiſtrate: and the firſt inſtance he giveth is that of the Prieſts: and ſo *Ariſtotle* would have the Prieſt to be ἐπιστάτης a Ruler, but not a civil Magiſtrate. So *de Repub. lib.* 7. *cap.* 8. he diſtinguiſheth between the Prieſts and the Judges in a Citty.

But to the matter. I will here endeavour to make theſe two things appear. 1. That no adminiſtration formally and properly Eccleſiaſticall (and namely the diſpencing of Church cenſures) doth belong unto the Magiſtrate, nor may (according to the word of God) be aſſumed and exerciſed by him, 2. That Chriſt hath not made the Magiſtrate head of the Church, to receive appeals (properly ſo called) from all Eccleſiaſticall Aſſemblies. Touching the firſt of theſe, it is no other than is held forth in the Iriſh Articles of Faith (famous among Orthodox and Learned men in theſe Kingdoms) which do plainly exclude the Magiſtrate from the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments, and from the power of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the unhappineſſe of this time that this and other truths formerly out of controverſie, ſhould be ſo much ſtuck at and doubted of by ſome.

Now that the corrective part of Church-Government, or the cenſure of ſcandalous perſons in reference to the purging of the Church, and keeping pure of the ordinances, is no part of the Magiſtrates office, but is a diſtinct charge belonging of right to Miniſters and Elders; as it may fully appear by the Arguments brought afterwards to prove a government in the Church diſtinct from Magiſtracy: (which Arguments will neceſſarily carry the power of Church cenſures and the adminiſtration of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven into other hands then the Magiſtrates;) ſo I ſhall here ſtrengthen it by theſe confirmations.

Firſt, Church-cenſures muſt needs be diſpenſed by Miniſters and Elders, becauſe they are heterogeneous to Magiſtracy: For firſt, the Magiſtrate by the power which is in his hand, ought

ought to punish any of his Subjects that doe evil, and he ought to punish like sins with like punishments. But if the power of Church-censures be in the Magistrates hands, he cannot walk by that rule; For Church-censures are onely for Church-members, not for all Subjects: 1 *Cor.* 5. 10. 12. Secondly, Church-censures are to be executed in the name of Christ, *Matth.* 18. 20. with vers. 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. and this cannot be done in his name, by any other but such as have commission from him to bind and loose, forgive and retain sins. But where is any such commission given to the civil Magistrate, Christian more then Heathen? Thirdly, Church-censures are for impenitent contumacious offenders: but the Magistrate doth and must punish offenders (when the course of Justice and law so requireth) whether they appear penitent or impenitent. Fourthly, The Magistrates power of punishing offenders, is bounded by the law of the land. What then shall become of such scandalls as are not crimes punishable by the law of the land? such as obscene rotten talking, adulterous and vile behaviour, or the most scandalous conversing and companying together (though the crime of adultery cannot be proved by witnesses) living in known malice and envie, refusing to be reconciled, and thereupon lying off (it may be for a long time) from the Sacrament, and the like, which are not proper to be taken notice of by the civil Judge. So that in this case, either there must be Church-censures and discipline exercised by Church-officers, or the Magistrate must go beyond his limits: Or lastly, Scandalls shall spread in the Church, and no remedy against them. Far be it from the thoughts of Christian Magistrates, that scandalls of this kind shall be tolerated, to the dishonour of God, the laying of the stumbling blocks of bad examples before others, and to the violation and pollution of the Ordinances of Jesus Christ, who hath commanded to keep his ordinances pure.

A second Argument may be this, In the old Testament God did not command the Magistrates, but the Priests to put a difference betwixt the prophane and the holy, the unclean and the clean: *Levit.* 10. 10. *Ezech.* 22. 26. *Ezech.* 44. 23, 24. *Deut.* 21. 5. 2 *Chron.* 23. 18, 19. And in the new Testament, the keyes

keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven are given to the Miniſters of the Church : *Matth.* 16. 19. and 18. 18. *John* 20. 23. but no where to the civil Magiſtrate. It belongeth to Church-officers to cenſure falſe doctrine. *Revel.* 2. 2. 14. 15. to decide controverſies, *Acts* 16. 4. and to examine and cenſure ſcandalls, *Ezech.* 44 23, 24. which is a Prophecy concerning the miniſtery of the New Teſtament. And Elders judge an Elder, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. or any other Church-member. 1 *Cor.* 5. 12.

Thirdly, The Scripture holdeth forth the civil and Eccleſiaſtical power as moſt diſtinct; inſomuch that it condemneth the *Spiritualizing* of the civil Power, aſwell as the *Secularizing* of the Eccleſiaſtical power; *State Papacy*, aſwell as *Papal-State*: Church-officers may not take the civil ſword, nor judg civil cauſes: *Luke* 12. 13, 14, and 22. 25. *Matth.* 26. 52. 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. So *Uzzah* might not touch the Ark: nor *Saul* offer burnt offerings: nor *Uzziah* burn incenſe: I wiſh we may not have cauſe to revive the proverb which was uſed in *Ambroſe* his time. *That Emperors did more covet the Prieſthood, then the Prieſts did covet the Empire.* Shall it be a ſin to Church-officers to exerciſe any act of civil government? and ſhal it be no ſin to the civil Magiſtrate to ingroſſe the whole and ſole power of Church-Goverment? Are not the two powers formally and ſpecifically diſtinct? Of which before, *Chap.* 4.

It is to be well noted that *Maccovius* and *Vedelius* who aſcribe a ſort of Papal power to the civil Magiſtrate, to the great ſcandall of the Reformed Church; do notwithſtanding acknowledge that Chriſt hath appointed Church diſcipline and cenſures, and the ſame to be diſpenced by Church-officers onely: And that the Magiſtrate as he may not preach the Word, and adminiſter the Sacraments; So he may not exerciſe Church-diſcipline, nor inflict ſpiritual cenſures, ſuch as excommunication. Though *Eraſtus* pag. 175. hath not ſpared to ſay, that the Magiſtrate may in the New Teſtament (though he might not in the old) exerciſe the miniſteriall function, if he can have ſo much leiſure from his other employments.

Fourthly, The power of Church-diſcipline is intrinſecall to the Church, that is, both they who cenſure, and they who

are censured, must be of the Church, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. 13. They must be of one and the same Corporation, the one must not be in the body, and the other out of the body. But if this power were in the Magistrate, it were extrinsecall to the Church. For the Magistrate *quatenus* a Magistrate, is not so much as a Church-member; far lesse can the magistrate as magistrate have jurisdiction over Church-members, as Church-members, even as the minister as minister is not a member of the Commonwealth or State, far lesse can he, as minister, exercise jurisdiction over the Subjects, as Subjects.

The Christian magistrate in *England* is not a member of the Church as a magistrate, but as a Christian. And the minister of Jesus Christ in *England*, is not subject to the magistrate as he is a minister of Christ, but as he is a member of the Commonwealth of *England* He was both a learned man and a great Royallist in *Scotland*, who held that all Kings, Infidel as well as Christian, have equal authority and jurisdiction in the Church, though all be not alike qualified or able to exercise it. *Jo. Wemius, de Reg. primat. pag.* 123. Let our opposites loose this knot among themselves; for they are not of one opinion about it.

Fifthly, Church-officers might and did freely and by themselves dispence Church-censures, under Pagan and unbeleeving magistrates, as is by all confessed: Now the Church ought not to be in a worse condition under the Christian magistrate, then under an Infidel; for the power of the Christian magistrate is *cumulative*, not *privative* to the Church; He is a *Nursing Father*, *Isa.* 49. 23. not a *Step-Father*. He is keeper, defender and guardian of both Tables, but neither Judge nor Interpreter of Scripture.

Sixthly, I shall shut up this Argumentation with a convincing *dilemma*. The Assemblies of Church-officers being to exercise discipline, and censure offences (which is supposed and must be granted in regard of the Ordinances of Parliament) either they have power to do this *Jure proprio*, and *virtute officii*: or onely *Jure deveoluto*, and *virtute delegationis*, such authority being derived from the magistrate; If the former, I have what I would; If the latter, then it followeth, 1. That where

where Presbyteries and Synods do exercise spirituall Jurisdiction, not by any power derived from, or dependant upon the civil Magistrate, but in the name and authority of *Jesus Christ*, and by the power received from him, as in *Scotland*, *France*, the *Low-Countries*, &c. there all Ecclesiastical censures, such as deposition of Ministers, and Excommunication of scandalous and obstinate persons. have been, are, and shall be void, null, and of no effect. Even as when the Prelaticall party did hold, that the power of ordination and jurisdiction pertaineth onely to Prelats, or such as are delegate with commission and authority from them: thereupon they were so put to it by the Arguments of the Anti-Episcopall party, that they were forced to say, that Presbyters ordained by Presbyters in other Reformed Churches, are no Presbyters, and their excommunication was no excommunication. 2. It will follow, that the Magistrate himself may excommunicate, for *nemo potest aliis delegare plus juris quam ipse habet*; No man can give from him by delegation or deputation to another, that right or power which he himself hath not. 3. If the power of excommunication come by delegation from the Magistrate, either the Magistrate must in conscience give this power to Church-officers onely, or he is free and may without sin give this power to others; If the former, what can bind up the Magistrates conscience, or astrict the thing to Church-Officers, except it be Gods ordinance that they only do it? If the latter, then though this Parliament hath hath taken away the old High Commission Court, which had *Potestatem utriusq; gladii*, yet they may lawfully and without sin erect a new High Commission Court, made up of those who shall be no Church-officers, yea having none of the Clergy in it (as the other had) with commission and power granted to them to execute spiritual Jurisdiction and Excommunication, and that not onely in this or that Church, yea or Province, but in any part of the whole Kingdom. So much of the first point. Now to the second, concerning appeals to the Magistrate, as to the head of the Church.

It is asked, what remedy shall there be against the abuse of Church-discipline by Church-officers, except there be appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the civil Magistrate: which if

it be, Church-officers will be the more wary and cautious to do no man wrong, knowing that they may be made to answer for it: And if it be not, there is a wide dore opened, that ministers may do as they please.

Answ. 1 Look what remedy there is for abuses in the preaching of the Word, and administration of the Sacraments; the like remedy there is for abuses in Church-discipline; Mal-administration of the Word and Sacraments is no lesse sinfull to the ministers, and hurtful to others, then mal-administration of discipline: and in some respects the former is more to the dishonour of God and destruction of men than the latter: Ministers have not an arbitrary power to preach what they will, Now when the word is not truly preached, nor the Sacraments duely administred by any minister or ministers, the Magistrate seeketh the redresse of these things (in a constituted Church) by the convocating of Synods, for examining, discovering, and judging of such errors and abuses as are found in particular Churches. But if the Synod should connive at, or comply with that same error; yet the Magistrate taketh not upon him the supreme and authoritative decision of a controversie of faith, but still endeavoureth to help all this by other Ecclesiastical remedies; as another Synod, and yet another, till the evil be removed. The like we say concerning abuses in Church-discipline: The Magistrate may command a resuming and re-examination of the case in another Synod: but still the Synod ratifieth or reverseth the censure. In which case it is betwixt the Magistrate and the Synod, as betwixt the will and understanding; for *Voluntas imperat Intellectui quo ad exercitium*, yet notwithstanding *determinatur per intellectum quoad specificationem actus.*

Take for instance this also. If it be a case deserving deposition or degradation: In such a case saith learned *Salmasius apar. ad lib. de primatu pag.* 298. the Prince or Magistrate cannot take from a minister that power which was given him in ordination with imposition of hands, for he cannot take away that which he cannot give. But if a Prince would have a minister for his offences to be deprived of his ministeriall power, he must take care that it be done by the ministers themselves; *qui Judi-*

ces

ces veri ipsius sunt, & auferre soli possunt quod per ordinationem dederunt. Who are his true Judges, and they onely can take away What by ordination they have given. Thus *Salmasius*.

2. And further, if Presbyteries or Synods exceed the bounds of Ecclesiasticall power, and go without the Sphære of their own activity, interposing and judging in a civil cause which concerneth any mans life or estate, The Magistrate may reverse and make null whatsoever they do in that kind, and punish themselves for such abuse of their power; As *Solomon* punished *Abiathar*, and banished him to *Anathoth*, he being guilty of high treason: 1 *Kings* 2. 26. It was not a case of scandall onely, or of Delinquency or mal-administration in his Sacerdotall office, otherwise it had fallen within the cognizance, and jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Sanhedrin.

3. Though the case be meerly spirituall and ecclesiastical the Christian Magistrate (by himself and immediatly) may not onely examine by the judgement of discretion the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, but also when he seeth cause (either upon the complaint of the party, or scandall given to himself) interpose by letters, messages, exhortations, and sharp admonitions to the Presbyterie or Synod, who in that case are bound in conscience, with all respect and honour to the Magistrate, to give him a reason of what they have done, and to declare the grounds of their proceedings, till by the blessing of God upon this free and fair dealing, they either give a rationall and satisfactory accompt to the Magistrate, or be themselves convinced of their mal-administration of Discipline.

4. And in extraordinary cases when the Clergy hath made defection, and all Church discipline is degenerated into Tyrannie, as under Popery and Prelacy it was; it belongeth to the Magistrate to take the protection of those who are cast out or censured unjustly; for extraordinary evils must have extraordinary helps. And in this sence we are to understand divers of our Reformers and others, groaning under the pressures of the Roman Clergy, and calling in the help of the civil Magistrate for their relief.

But we deny that (in a well constituted Church) it is agreeable to the will of Christ, for the Magistrate, either

(e) Synopſ. pur. Theol. diſp. 48. Theſ. 19. *Etſi vero hanc ſpiritualem poteſtatem a Chriſtiani Magiſtratus miſpectione, tanquam utriuſque tabulæ cuſtode non eximimus, negamus tamen eam, aut ejus praxin a Magiſtratus ſuprema auctoritate pendere, ſicuti quidam recentiores contendant, cum a Chriſto ſolo pendeat, & ab ipſo immediate Eccleſiæ ſit conceſſa ut loci antea producti demonſtrant. Ac proinde nec per appellationem, aut provocationem proprie dictam, poteſtas hæc ad Magiſtratus aut Principum tribunal deferri poteſt, quum ejus executio penes ipſos non ſit.*

(e) to receive appeals (properly ſo called) from the ſentence of an Eccleſiaſtical Court, or to receive complaints exhibited againſt that ſentence by the party cenſured, ſo as by his authority, upon ſuch complaint, to nullifie or make void the Eccleſiaſtical cenſure. The latter of theſe two *Vedelius* pleadeth for, not the former. But *Apollonius* oppugneth the latter, as being upon the matter all one with the former. Now to aſcribe ſuch power to the Magiſtrate, is 1. To change the *Pope*, but not the *Popedome*; the *Head*, but not the *Headſhip*; for is not this the Popes chief ſupremacy, to judge all men, and to be judged of no man, to ratifie or reſcind at his pleaſure the decrees of the Church, Councels and all: and ſhall this power now be tranſferred upon the Magiſtrate? Good Lord, where are we, if this ſhall be the up-ſhot of our Reformation? Oh for it? Shall we condemn the Papiſts and Anabaptiſts who give too little to the Magiſtrate, and then joyn hands with the Arminians, who give as much to the Magiſtrate as the Pope hath formerly uſurped? 2. Appeals lie in the ſame line of ſubordination, and do not go *de genere in genus*; but the civil and Eccleſiaſticall Courts ſtand not in one line, neither are they of one kind and nature; they are *diſparata, non ſubordinata*. 3. They who receive appeals, have alſo power to execute the ſentence, elſe the appeal is in vain. But the Magiſtrate hath no power to execute the Church cenſure, nor to ſhut out of the Church, our oppoſites themſelves being Judges. It was not therefore without juſt cauſe that *Auguſtine* did very much blame the *Donatiſts* for their appealing from the Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies, to the Emperors and civil Courts, *Epiſt.* 48. and *Epiſt.* 162.

There are two examples alledged from Scripture for appeals from Eccleſiaſtical to Civil Courts: One is the example of *Jeremiah*; *Jer.* 26. The other is the example of *Paul*, *Act.* 25. But neither of the two prove the point. For 1. *Jeremiah* was not cenſured by the Prieſts with any Spirituall or Eccleſiaſtical cenſure (of which alone our controverſie is) but the Prieſts took him and ſaid to him, *Thou ſhalt ſurely die. Jer.* 26. 8. 2. Would God that every Chriſtian Magiſtrate may protect the ſervants of God from ſuch unjuſt ſentences and perſecuting decrees. When Eccleſiaſticall Courts are made up of bloody perſecu-

perſecuters, that is an extraordinary evil which muſt have an extraordinary remedy. 3. Neither yet is there any ſyllable of *Jeremiahs* appealing from the Prieſts to the Princes, but the Text ſaith, *When the Princes of Judah heard theſe things, then they came up*, &c. *verſe* 10. that is, The Princes ſo ſoon as they underſtood that the Prieſts had taken *Jeremiah*, and had ſaid to him *Thou ſhalt ſurely die. verſe* 8. And being alſo informed that all the people were gathered together tumultuouſly and diſorderly againſt the Prophet, *verſe* 9. They thought it their duty to reſcue the Prophet from the Prieſts and people, that he might be examined and judged by the civil Court, he being challenged and accuſed as one worthy to die.

As for *Pauls* Appellation to *Cæſar*. Firſt, It is ſuppoſed by our oppoſites that he appealed from the Eccleſiaſtical Sanhedrin of the Jews, which is a great miſtake; For he appealed from the Judgement-ſeat of *Feſtus* to *Cæſar*; that is, from an inferiour civil Court, to a ſuperiour civil Court, which he had juſt cauſe to do: for though *Feſtus* had not yet given forth any ſentence againſt *Paul*, yet he appeals *à gravamine*, and it was a great grievance indeed, while as *Feſtus* ſhew'd himſelf to be a moſt corrupt Judge, who though the Jews could prove none of thoſe things whereof they accuſed *Paul*, *Act.* 25. 7. (which ſhould have made *Feſtus* to acquit and diſmiſſe him) yet being willing to do the Jews a pleaſure, he would have *Paul* to go to *Jeruſalem*, there to be judged before himſelf. *verſe* 9. Now this was all the favour that the Jews had deſired of *Feſtus*, that he would ſend *Paul* to *Jeruſalem*, they laying wait in the way to kill him. *verſ.* 3. No appellation here from the Sanhedrin at *Jeruſalem*, where he had not as yet compeered to be examined, far leſſe could he appeal from any ſentence of the Sanhedrin. The moſt which can be with any colour alleadged from the Text, is, that *Paul* declined to be judged by the Sanhedrin at *Jeruſalem*, they not being his competent and proper Judges in that cauſe. *I ſtand at Cæſars Judgement-ſeat* ſaith he, *where I ought to be judged*; meaning that he was accuſed as worthy of death, for ſedition, and offending againſt *Cæſar*; whereof he ought to be judged onely at *Cæſars* Tribunall; not by the Jews, who were no Judges of ſuch matters. A declinator of a

Judge

Judge is one thing, and Appellation from his Judgement or sentence is another thing. But put the case that *Paul* had indeed appealed from the Sanhedrin at *Jerusalem*, either it was the civil Sanhedrin, or the Ecclesiasticall. If the civil, it is no President for appeals from Ecclesiastical Courts. If the Ecclesiastical, yet that serveth not for appeals from Ecclesiasticall Courts in Ecclesiasticall causes; for it was a capital crime whereof *Paul* was accused. Nay, put the case that *Paul* had at that time appealed from the Ecclesiastical Sanhedrin in an Ecclesiastical cause: yet neither could that help our opposites, for the government of the Christian Church, and the government of the Jewish Church were at that time separate and distinct, so that the Ecclesiastical Court, which should have judged of any scandall given by *Paul* (if at all he ought to have been censured) had been a Christian Synod, not a Jewish Sanhedrin. And so much of Appeals. Of which Question *Triglandius*, *Revius*, and *Cabeljavius*, have peculiarly and fully written. Three famous Academies also, of *Leyden*, *Groening*, and *Utrecht*, did give their publike testimonies against appeals from Ecclesiastical to civil Courts. And the three Professors of *Utrecht* in their testimony do obtest all Christians that love truth and peace, to be cautious and wary of the Arminian poyson lurking in the contrary Tenent. See *Cabeljav. defensio potestatis Ecclesiastica.* pag. 60.

It is further objected, That thus fixing a spirituall jurisdiction in Church-officers, we erect two collateral Powers in the Kingdom, the Civil and the Ecclesiastical, unlesse all Ecclesiastical Courts be subordinate to Magistracy, as to a certain head-ship.

Answ. There is a subordination of Persons here, but a co-ordination of powers: A subordination of Persons, because as the Ministers of the Church are subject to the civil Magistrate, they being members of the Common-wealth or Kingdom; So the Magistrate is subject to the Ministers of the Church, he being a Church-member.

The former we assert against Papists, who say that the Clergy is not subject to the Magistrate. The latter we hold against those who make the Magistrate to be the head of the Church:

Again

Again, a co-ordination of powers; becauſe as the ſubjection of the perſon of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate to the Paſtors and Elders of the Church, in things pertaining to God, doth not inferre the ſubordination of the power and office of the Magiſtrate to the Church-officers: So the ſubjection of Paſtors and Elders to the Magiſtrate in all civil things (as other members of the Common-wealth are ſubject) may well conſiſt with the co-ordination of the Eccleſiaſtical power with the civil. And as it is an error in Papiſts to make the ſecular power dependant upon, and derived from the Eccleſiaſticall power: So it is an error in others to make the Eccleſiaſtical power derived from, and dependant upon the civil power: for the Eccleſiaſtical power is derived from Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 4. 11.

And now while I am expreſſing my thoughts, I am the more confirmed in the ſame, by falling upon the conceſſion of one who is of a different Judgement; For he who wrote *Jus Regum* in oppoſition to all ſpiritual authority exerciſed under any forme of Eccleſiaſtical Government, doth notwithſtanding acknowledge pag. 16. *Both of them* (the Magiſtrate and the Miniſter) *have their Commiſſion immediatly from God, and each of them are ſubject to the other, without any ſubordination of offices from the one to the other, for the Magiſtrate is no leſſe ſubject to the operation of the Word from the mouth of the Miniſter, then any other man whatſoever: And the Miniſter again is as much ſubject to the authority of the Magiſtrate as any other Subject whatſoever; And therefore though there be no ſubordination of Offices, yet is there of Perſons; the Perſon of a Miniſter remaining a Subject, but not the function of the Miniſtery.* He might have ſaid the ſame of the exerciſe of Church-diſcipline which he ſaith of the preaching of the Word, for the ſame Chriſt who gave the keyes of doctrine, gave alſo the keys of diſcipline, without any tye to make the uſe thereof ſubject to the pleaſure of the civil Magiſtrate. Let him prove that the miniſtery of the Word is not ſubordinate to, nor dependant upon the Magiſtrate; and I ſhall prove by the ſame *medium*, that the miniſtery of Church-cenſures hath as little of that ſubordination in it.

And this I muſt adde, that leaſt of all others can our Independent brethren charge the Presbyterians with the ſetting up

of an Ecclesiastical Government co-ordinate with, and not subordinate unto the civil Government: For themselves hold as much in this point (if not more) then we do. Take for instance Mr. *Cotton* his *keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, published by Mr. *Goodwyn* and Mr. *Nye*, pag. 49. *The first Subject of the ministeriall power of the keyes, though it be independent in respect of derivation of power from the power of the sword to the performance of any spiritual administration*: &c. Pag. 53. *As the Church is subject to the sword of the Magistrate in things which concerne the civil peace: so the Magistrate (if Christian) is subject to the keyes of the Church.* &c.

As for that collaterality which is objected, I answer, The Civil and Ecclesiastical power, if we speak properly, are not collateral. 1. They have no footing upon the same ground: there may be many subject to the Magistrate, who are no Church-Members, and so not under the Spiritual power: and where the same persons are subject to both the powers, there is no more collaterality in this case, nay, not so much, as is betwixt the power of a Father in one man, and the power of a Master in another man, when both powers are exercised upon the same man who is both a son and a servant. 2. Powers that are collateral, are of the same eminency and altitude, of the same kinde and nature; but the civil Power is a Dominion and Lordship: the Ecclesiastical power is Ministerial, not Lordly. 3. Collateral powers do mutually and alike exercise authority over each other respectively. But, though the Magistrate may exercise much authority in things Ecclesiastical, Church-Officers can exercise no authority in things civil. The Magistrates authority is Ecclesiastical *objective*, though not *formaliter*: but the Church-Officers authority is not civil so much as *objective*, not being exercised about either civil, criminal, or capital cases. 4. Collateral powers are subordinate to, and derived from the Supreme and Original power, like two branches growing out of the same stock, two streams flowing from the same fountain, two lines drawn from the same center, two arms under the same head. But the power of the Magistrate is subordinate unto, and dependeth upon the Dominion of God the Creator of all: the power of Church-Officers dependeth upon

on the Dominion of Christ, the Mediator and King of the Church.

I shall conclude my answers to the present Objection, with the Testimony of learned [d] *Salmasius*, who hath so overthrown the Papal and Prelatical Government from Scripture and antiquity, that he hath withall preserved, yea strengthened the distinction of civil Government and Church-government, and holdeth that Church-censures and civil punishments do very well consist and sweetly agree together.

(d) Apparat. ad lib. de Primatu pag. 282, 283. *Plebs autem ipsa quam curant Pastores, quantum attinet ad animæ curam, Pastoribus suis subdita est. Si corporis ratio agatur, summum in illud Imperium habent Principes ac Supremi Magistratus. Delicta igitur hominum dupliciter puniuntur, aut in anima sola, aut in corpore. Pœnæ quæ corporis necem aut noxam inferunt, aut bonorum amissionem, a Magistratu civili infliguntur: Quæ vero animarum castigationem & emendationem spectant, per Ministrum Ecclesiæ imponuntur. Summa earum pœnarum excommunicatio est.* Et infra. *Idem peccatum in eodem homine aliter vindicat Magistratus civilis, aliter punit Minister Ecclesiæ.*

I have now done with the negative part of this present Controversie, what the power of the Magistrate *in Ecclesiasticis* is not. I proceed to the positive part, what it is. To this I will speak first more generally, then more particularly.

For the general, I hold with the large Confession of Faith of the Church of *Scotland*; *Art.* 25. *Moreover to Kings, Princes, Rulers, and Magistrates, we affirm, that chiefly and most principally, the conservation and the purgation of the Religion appertains; so that not onely they are appointed for civil Policy, but also for maintenance of the true Religion, and for suppressing of Idolatry and Superstition whatsoever.* To the same purpose, *Calvin*, *Instit. lib.* 4. *cap.* 20. *sect.* 9. *Hoc nomine maximè laudantur sancti Reges, quòd Dei cultum corruptum vel eversum restituerint, vel curam gesserint Religionis, ut sub illis pura & incolumis floreret.* The like see in *Zanchius in* 4. *præc. pag.* 791. and in *Polanus Syntag. lib.* 10. *cap.* 65. They hold that the Christian Magistrate his Office, as concerning Religion, is, *diligently to take care that in his Dominion, or Kingdom, Religion from the pure Word of God, expounded by the Word of God it self, and understood according to the Principles of Faith (which others call the Analogy of Faith) be either in-*

stituted, or (being instituted) kept pure; or being corrupted, be restored and reformed: that false Doctrines, Abuses, Idolls, and Superstitions be taken away, to the glory of God, and to his own and his Subjects salvation. Unto these things I do assent as unto safe and undoubted truths.

But for the clearer understanding and enodation of our present Question, I will particularize and explain what I hold, by these five following Distinctions.

1. *Distingue materiam subjectam.* There are two sorts of things belonging to the Church. Some which are intrinsecal, and belonging to the soul or inward man, directly and primarily. Such things are not to be dispensed and administred by the civil Magistrate, I mean the Word and Sacraments, the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Suspension or Excommunication of Church-Officers or Members, the Ordination or Deposition of Officers, the Determination and Resolution from Scripture of Controversies concerning the Faith, the Worship of God, the Government of the Church, Cases of Conscience. These being in their nature, end, and use, meerly spiritual, and belonging not to the outward man, but to the inward man or soul, are committed and intrusted to the Pastors and other ruling Officers of the Church, and are not of civil and extrinsecal, but of Ecclesiastical and intrinsecal cognizance and judgement. There are other things belonging to the Church, which are extrinsecal and do properly belong to the outward man, and are common to the Church with other humane Societies or Corporations. Things of this kinde fall within the civil Jurisdiction. For the Churches of Christ, being Societies of men and women, and parts of Commonwealths, are accountable unto and punishable by the civil Magistrate, in their bodies, lives, civil Liberties, and temporal Estates, for trespasses against the Law of God or the Law of the Land: By the Law of God I understand here *Jus divinum naturale*, that is, the moral Law or Decalogue, as it bindeth all Nations (whether Christians or Infidels) being the Law of the Creator and King of Nations. The Magistrate by his authority, may and in duty ought to keep his Subjects within the bounds of external obedience to that Law, and punish the

the external man with external punishments for external trespasses against that Law. From this obligation of the Law, and subjection to the corrective power of the Magistrate, Christian Subjects are no more exempted then Heathen Subjects, but rather more straitly obliged. So that if any such trespasse is committed by Church-Officers or Members, the Magistrate hath power and authority to summon, examine, judge, and (after just conviction and proof) to punish these, as well as other men. We do therefore abominate the disloyal Papal Tenent, that Clergy men are not to be examined and judged by civil, but by Ecclesiastical Courts onely, even in causes civil and criminal. Whereof see *Duarenus de Sacr. Eccl. Minist. lib. 1. cap. 2. Spelman Concil. Britann. Tom. 1. pag. 413.*

I further explane my self by that common distinction, that there are two sorts of things that belong to the Church, τὰ ἔσω and τὰ ἔξω, *things inward*, and *things outward*. For Church Officers and Church-members do consist (as other men) of a soul, and of a body. All things properly belonging to the soul or internal man, (which here we call *things inward*) are the object of Ecclesiastical power given to Church-officers, Pastors, and other ruling officers. But what belongs to the outward man, to the bodies of Church-officers and members (which things are *outward*) the judging and managing thereof, is in the hand of the Magistrate, who ruleth not onely τὰς ἔξω, *those that are without*, whom the Church judgeth not, but τὰ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *the things outward of the Church*. *Salmasius* calls the power of the Magistrate in things Ecclesiastical ἐξωτερικὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, *the outward Episcopacy or overseeing*. Which well agreeth with that which *Constantine* said to the Bishops, ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν ἔσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτός. *You are made Bishops of the inward things of the Church, I of the things outward*. So that he doth not assume their government, but distinguisheth his from theirs. This external inspection and administration of the Magistrate, in reference to Religion, is twofold. 1. *Corrective*, by externall punishments. 2. *Auxiliary*, by externall benefits and adminicles. The Magistrate may and ought to be both *Custos & vindex utriusq; Tabulæ*, he ought to preserve both the first and second Table of the holy and good Law of God, from

being despised and violated, and punish by corporal or other temporal punishments such (whether Church-Officers or Church-members) as openly dishonour God by grosse offences, either against the first or against the second Table; and this he doth as Gods Deputy and Vicegerent subordinate and subservient to that universall dominion which God almighty exerciseth over the children of men. But in doing hereof, he is also helpfull and usefull to the Kingdom of Christ as Mediator; Magistracy being (in the respects aforesaid) serviceable and profitable (as to order the Common-wealth aright, so also) to purge the Church of scandals, to promote the course of the Gospel, and the edification of one another. But how? not perfectly, but *pro tanto*; not every way, but *more suo*; not intrinsecally, but extrinsecally; not primarily, but secundarily; not directly, but *ex consequenti*; not *sub formalitate scandali, sed sub formalitate criminis*, not under the notion of scandall, but of crime; The Magistrate in punishing all crimes committed by any in the Church (which are contrary to the Law of God) in suppressing tumults, disorders, in protecting the Church from danger, harme, or molestation, in putting a hook in the nostrils, and a bridle in the mouthes of unruly, obstinate, and contumacious sinners, who vexe the Church, and create trouble to the people of God; in so doing, he doth by consequence, and *removendo prohibens*, purge the Church, and advance the Kingdom of Christ, and the course of the Gospel: In the mean while not depriving the Church of her owne intrinsecall power and Jurisdiction, but making it rather more effectuall by the aid of the secular power. And so much of the corrective part of the Magistrates administration. The other part of his administration in reference to Religion, is auxiliary, or assistant to the Church. For the Magistrate watcheth over the outward businesse of the Church, not onely by troubling those persons, and punishing those sins that trouble the Israel of God; but by administring such things as are necessary for the well being and comfortable subsistence of the Church, and for that end, doth convocate Synods *pro re nata*, (beside the ordinary and set meetings) and presideth therein (if he please) in externall order, though not in the Synodicall debates and resolutions

ſolutions: He addeth his civil ſanction to the Synodical reſults, if he find nothing therein which may hurt Peace or Juſtice in the Common-wealth. The Magiſtrate ought alſo to take care of the maintenance of the Miniſtery, Schooles, poor, and of good works for neceſſary uſes, that Religion and Learning may not want their neceſſary adminicles. Finally, He ought to take care that all Churches be provided with an able, orthodox, and Godly Miniſtery, and Schools with learned and well qualified Teachers, ſuch as ſhall be beſt approved by thoſe to whom it belongeth to examine and Judge of their qualifications and parts. And all theſe wayes the Magiſtrate ought to be, and the well affected Magiſtrate hath been and is a nurſing Father to the Church of Chriſt.

2. My ſecond diſtinction ſhall be this: The Magiſtrate may and ought not onely to conſerve Juſtice, peace and order in the Common-wealth, and in the Church, as it is in the Common-wealth, but alſo to take ſpeciall care of the conſervation of the true Reformed Religion, and of the Reformation of it when and wherein it needeth to be reformed, *imperativè*, not *elicitivè*. The Magiſtrate ſaith Dr. *Rivet* on the decalogue, pag. 262. is neither to adminiſter Word, nor Sacraments, nor Church diſcipline, &c. but he is to take care that all theſe things be done by thoſe whom God hath called thereunto. What ever is properly ſpiritual belonging to the ſoul and inward man (ſuch as Church-cenſures, and the other particulars before mentioned) cannot be *actus elicitus* of the Magiſtrate: The Magiſtrate can neither *immediatione ſuppoſiti*, nor *immediatione virtutis*, determine controverſies of faith, ordain Miniſters, ſuſpend from the Sacraments, or excommunicate. He can neither doe theſe things himſelf; nor are they done in the name and authority of the Magiſtrate or by any Miniſteriall power receeived from him, but in the name and authority of Jeſus Chriſt, and by the power given from Jeſus Chriſt. Yet all theſe and generally the adminiſtration of the keyes of the Kingdom of heaven, are *actus imperati* of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, and that both *antecedenter* and *conſequenter*. *Antecedently*, the Magiſtrate may command Church-officers to ſuſpend or excommunicate all obſtinate and ſcandalous

scandalous persons: he may command the Classis to ordain able and godly ministers, and no other: he may command a Synod to meet, to debate and determine such or such a controversie. *Consequently* also, when the thing is examined, judged, resolved, or done by the Ecclesiasticall power, the Magistrate hath power and authority to adde his civil sanction confirmation, or ratification, to make the Ecclesiasticall sentence to be obeyed and submitted unto by all whom it concerneth. In all which the Christian Magistrate doth exceeding much for the conservation and purgation of Religion: not *eliciendo actus*, doing or exercising by himself or by his owne authority acts of Church-Government or discipline, but taking care, that such and such things be done by those to whom they do belong.

3. Distinguish the *directive* part and the *coercive* part. The directive part, in the conservation or purgation of Religion, doth belong to the Ministers and ruling Officers of the Church assembled together; In administring therefore that which concerneth Religion and peoples spirituall good, the Magistrate not onely *juvatur*, but *dirigitur*, is not onely *helped*, but *directed* by the Ecclesiastical directive power; *Fest. Hon. Disp.* 30. *Thes.* 6. Magistracy may say to Ministery as *Moses* said to *Hobab*; *Thou mayest be to us in stead of eyes. Ad sacræ Religionis informationem, fidelis Magistratus verbi divini administris, veluti oculis, uti debet*; and for that end he is to make use of consistoriall and Synodicall Assemblies say the Professors of *Leyden*, *Synops. pur. Theol. Disp.* 50. *Thes.* 44. But the coercive part, in compelling the obstinate and unruly, to submit to the Presbyteriall or Synodicall sentence, belongs to the Magistrate. Not as if the Magistrate had nothing to do, but to be an executioner of the pleasure of Church-officers, or as if he were by a blind and implicite faith to constrain all men to stand to their determination. God forbid. The Magistrate must have his full liberty to judge of that which he is to compell men to do, to judge of it, not onely *judicio apprehensivo*, by understanding and apprehending aright what it is, but *judicio discretivo*, by the judgement of Christian prudence and discretion, examining

examining by the Word of God, the grounds, reasons, and warrants of the thing, that he may in Faith, and not doubtingly, adde his authority thereto. In which judging, he doth *Judicare*, but not *Judicem agere*; that is, he is *Judex suarum actionum*, he judgeth whether he ought to adde his civil authority to this or that which seemeth good to Church-officers, and doth not concur therewith, except he be satisfied in his Conscience that he may do so; yet this makes him not supreme Judge or Governour in all Ecclesiastical causes, which is the Prerogative of Jesus Christ, revealing his will in his word: nor yet doth it invest the Magistrate with the subordinate ministeriall forensicall directive judgement in Ecclesiastical things or causes, which belongeth to Ecclesiasticall not to civil Courts.

4. Distinguish between a *Cumulative* and a *Privative* authority. The Magistrate hath indeed an authoritative influence into matters of Religion and Church-Government; but it is cumulative, that is, the Magistrate takes care that Church-officers as well as other Subjects may do those things which *ex officio* they are bound to do; and when they do so, he aideth, assisteth, strengtheneth, ratifieth, and in his way, maketh effectuall what they do. But that which belongs to the Magistrate is not privative, in reference to the Ecclesiastical Government. It is understood *salvo jure Ecclesiastico*: for the Magistrate is a nursing Father, not a step-Father to the Church: and the Magistrate (as well as other men) is under that tye; 2 *Cor.* 13. 8. *We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.* This *Proviso* therefore is justly made, that whatever power the Magistrate hath in matters of Religion, it is not to hinder the free exercise of Church discipline and censures against scandalous and obstinate sinners.

As the Casuists in other cases distinguish *Lucrum cessans*, and *damnum emergens*, so must we distinguish between the Magistrate his doing no good to the Church, and his doing evil to the Church: between his not assisting, and his opposing: between his not allowing or authorizing, and his forbidding or restraining. It doth properly and of right belong to the Magistrate to adde a civil sanction and strength of a law for strengthning and aiding the exercise of Church discipline, or not to add it. And

himself is Judge whether to add any such cumulative act of favour or not. But the Magistrate hath no power nor authority to lay bands and restraints upon Church-officers to hinder any of Christs ordinances, or to forbid them to do what Christ hath given them a commission to do. And if any such restraints of prohibitions or lawes should be laid on us, we ought to obey God rather than men.

5. *Distingue tempora.* Whatever belongs to the Magistrate in matters of Religion, more then falls under the former distinctions, is extraordinary, and doth not belong to ordinary Government. In extraordinary reformations the Magistrate may do much by his owne immediate authority, when Synods have made defection either from the truth of doctrine, or from holinesse and godlinesse: yet in such a case he ought to consult with such orthodox godly Divines as can be had, either in his owne or from other Dominions. *Fest. Hon. Disp.* 30. *Thes.* 5.

And so much be spoken of the Magistrate his power and duty in things and causes Ecclesiasticall. As we do not deny to the Magistrate any thing which the Word of God doth allow him, so we dare not approve his going beyond the bounds and limits which God hath set him. And I pray God that this be not found to be the bottome of the controversie, Whether Magistracy shall be an arbitrary Government; if not in civil, yet in Ecclesiasticall things? Whether the Magistrate may do, or appoint to be done in the matter of Church-Government, admission to, or exclusion from the Ordinances of Christ, what ever shall seem good in his eyes? And whether in purging of the Church he is obliged to follow the rules of Scripture, and to consult with learned and godly Ministers? although *Erastus* himself (as is before observed) and *Sutlivius* (a great follower of him) *de Presbyt. cap.* 8. are ashamed of, and do disclaim such assertions.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

That by the Word of God there ought to be another Government beside Magistracy (or Civil Government, namely an Ecclesiastical Government (properly so called) in the hands of Church-officers.

THis Question hath arisen from Mr. *Colemans* third and fourth rule which he offered to the Parliament, excluding all Government of Church-officers, Ministers and Elders; that is, as he expounds himself all corrective government, leaving them no power except what is meerly doctrinal, and appropriating all government properly so called to the Magistrate onely. Mr. *Hussey* following him falls in the same ditch with him. The Question is not whether Church-officers ought to have any share in the Civil Government? Nor whether Church-officers may have any Lordly government or imperious domination over the Lords heritage? Nor whether Church-Officers may exercise an arbitrary irregular Government, and rule as themselves list? God forbid. But the Question plainly is, Whether there may not, yea ought not to be in the Church a Ministeriall or Ecclesiastical Government properly so called, beside the civil Government or Magistracy. Mr. *Coleman* did, and Mr. *Hussey* doth hold there ought not. I

hold there ought: and I shall propound for the affirmative these Arguments.

The first Argument I draw from 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders that rule Well.* Mr. *Hussey pag.* 8. askes whether the word Elder be *prima*, or *secunda notio.* If *prima notio*, why must not Elder women be Church-officers as well as Elder men? If *secunda notio* for a ruling Officer, Parliament men, Kings and all Civil Governours are such Elders. I know no use which that distinction of *prima* and *secunda notio* hath in this place, except to let us know that he understands these Logicall termes. *Egregiam vero laudem.* He might have saved himself the labour, for who knowes not *Heromes* distinction? Elder is either a word of age or of office: but in Ecclesiasticall use it is a word of office. Mr. *Husseys* first notion concerning Elder women is no masculine notion. His second notion is an anti-parliamentary notion. For the honourable Houses of Parliament in the first words of their Ordinance concerning ordination of Ministers have declared, that by the word of God a Bishop and a Presbyter or Elder are all one; for thus beginneth the Ordinance, *Whereas the Word Presbyter, that is to say Elder, and the word Bishop, do in the Scripture intend and signifie one and the same function, &c.* Therefore Parliament men and civil Governors cannot be the Elders mentioned by the Apostle *Paul*, except Mr. *Hussey* make them Bishops, and invest them with power of ordination. Besides this, if Kings and Parliament men be such Elders as are mentioned in this Text, then the Ministers of the Word must have not onely an equall share in Government, but more honour and maintenance then Kings and Parliament men. See how well Mr. *Hussey* pleadeth for Christian Magistracy: It is also an anti-Scripturall notion, for some of those Elders that ruled well, did labour in the Word and Doctrine, as *Paul* tells us in the very same place; these (sure) are not civil Governours. Wherefore Mr. *Hussey* must seek a third notion before he hit the Apostles meaning. It is not *hujus loci* to debate from this Text the distinction of two sorts of Elders; though among all the answers which ever I heard or read, Mr. *Husseys* is the weakest, pag. 11. that by Elders that labour in the Word and Doctrine, are meant those

Ministers

Miniſters whoſe excellencie lies in Doctrine and inſtruction, and that by Elders that rule, are meant thoſe that give reproof. He contradiſtinguiſheth a reproving miniſter from a miniſter labouring in the Word and Doctrine. The very reproof given by a miniſter will be, (it ſeemes) at laſt challenged as an act of government. It is as wide from the mark, that he will have the two ſorts of Elders to differ thus, that the one muſt governe and not preach, the other muſt preach and not govern; not obſerving that the Text makes ruling to be common to both. The one doth both rule and labour in the Word and Doctrine: The other ruleth onely, and is therefore called ruling Elder, *non quia ſolus præeſt, ſed quia ſolum præeſt.* But to let all theſe things be laid aſide as heterogeneous to this preſent Argument: the point is, here are Rulers in the Church who are no civil Rulers. Yea this my Argument from this Text was clearly yeelded by Mr. *Coleman* in his *Maledicis* pag. 8. *But I will deal clearly* ſaith he, *theſe Officers are Miniſters, which are inſtituted not here, but elſe-where; and theſe are the Rulers here mentioned. Ergo*, he yeeldeth Eccleſiaſtical rulers (and thoſe inſtituted) diſtinct from Magiſtracy. Neither is it a Lordly but a miniſteriall ruling of which our Queſtion is. *For my part* ſaith Mr. *Huſſey, I know not how Lordſhip and Government doth differ one from another.* Then every Governour of a ſhip muſt be a lord. Then every Steward of a great houſe muſt be lord of the Houſe. There is an œconomicall or miniſterial government, and of that we mean.

My ſecond Argument I take from 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. *And we beſeech you brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you.* Προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν, *qui præſunt vobis.* Hence doth *Calvin* conclude (e) a Church Government diſtinct from civil government, for this is a ſpirituall Government, it is *in the Lord*, that is in the name of the Lord, or (as others) in things pertaining to God. Hence alſo *Beza* argueth againſt Epiſcopall Government; becauſe the Elders in the Apoſtolique Churches did govern in common.

(e) *Præſunt in Domino. Hoc additum videtur ad notandum ſpirituale regimen. Tametſi enim Reges quoque & Magiſtratus Dei ordinatione præſunt, quia tamen Eccleſiæ gubernationem Dominus peculialiter vult ſuam agnoſci, ideo nominatim præeſſe in Domino dicuntur, qui Chriſti nomine & mandato Eccleſiam gubernant.*

But saith Mr. *Hussey pag.* 18. *Pasor telleth us that* προϊστάμαι *with a genitive case signifieth* præcedo, *and then it signifieth no more but them that go before you, either by Doctrine or example.* I answer first to the matter, next to the force of the Word. For the matter, certainly the προστασία or ruling power of ministers, is not meerly doctrinall or perswasive, as is manifest by 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. where those who are not convinced of two sorts of Elders, are yet fully convinced of two sorts of acts, the act of ruling, and the act of teaching. Whatsoever that Text hath more in it, or hath not, this it hath, that those who labour in the Word and Doctrine, are Rulers; but they are more especially to be honoured for their labouring in the Word and Doctrine. Next, as to the force of the Word, if it be true which Mr. *Hussey* here saith, then the English Translators that read *are over you*; *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Bullinger*, *Gualther*, and others that here follow *Hierome*, and read *præsunt vobis*; *Arias Montanus* who reads *præsidentes vobis*, have not well understood the Greek. But if Mr. *Hussey* would needs correct all these and many more, Why did he not at least produce some instances to shew us where the words προϊστάμενος, or προστάς, or προστάτης, or προστασία, or προστατέια, are used for no more, but a meer going before, either by doctrine or example, without any power or authority of Government. Yea if this here be no more but a going before either by Doctrine or example, then every good Christian who goeth before others by good example is προϊστάμενος; Neither will that of the genitive case help him, for see the like 1 *Tim.* 3. 4. τὸ ἰδίου οἴκου καλῶς προϊστάμενον, *one that ruleth well his owne house*, Mr. *Hussey* will make it no more but this, *one that goeth before his owne house*, by teaching them, or by giving them good example, though the very next words tell us there is more in it, and that is authoritative governement, *having his children in subjection.* So vers. 12. τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι ruling their children well. *Pasor* is not at all against my sence, but for it: for if Mr. *Hussey* will make *Pasor* to say that προϊστάμαι with a genitive doth never signifie any more but *præcedo*, then he makes him to say both that which is manifestly false, and in so saying to contradict himself, for *Pasor* tells us also, the word signifieth *præsum*, and for that he cites 1 *Tim.* 3. 4. where

where it is with a genitive. Sometime indeed with a genitive it may be turned *præcedo*, as *Pasor* saith, but he citeth onely *Tit.* 3. 8. where it is not *Genitivus personæ* (as 1 *Thes.* 5. but *rei*; and we may also read *præstare*, as *A. Montanus* to excell or be chief in good works, or *to maintain*, as our books have it.

But furthermore I shall offer for answer to Mr. *Hussey* the observation of an excellent Grecian. It is (f) *Salmasius de primatu Papæ, pag.* 18, 19. προεστὰς, to speak properly, is another thing then πρωτοστάτης: the former signifieth a power of jurisdiction and government: the latter a precedence or placing of one before another: although they are sometimes used promiscuously, and although προεστάτης are also πρωτοστάται. Yea they have the very names of προεστάτης and προεστῶτες or προϊσταμένοι (if you look to the native Etymologie of the words) from their precedence or standing before, even as *Antistites quasi ante stantes*, and *prætor quasi præitor*: such names being chosen (for mollifying and dulcifying of Government) as might hold forth precedence, rather then high sounding names of power and authority. I shall adde but two testimonies of ancient Grecians: *Plato Epist.* 7. near the end: ἢ μεγάλης προεστὼς πόλεως, καὶ πολλῶν ἀρχούσης ἐλαττόνων, τὴ ἑαυτῆ πόλει τὰ τῶν σμικροτέρων χρήματα διανέμῃ μὴ κατὰ δίκην. *Or if he that ruleth some great City, and such as hath the dominion over many smaller Cities, should unjustly distribute to his owne City the means and substance of those lesser Cities. Dionysius Areopagita Epist.* 8. speaking of *Moses* his supreme power of rule and government over Israel, which was envyed by *Korah* and his faction, calls it τὴν τῆ λαῆ προστασίαν.

(f) *Et hoc nomine differt* πρωτοστασία *a* προστασία, *quod hæc præsidentiam cum potestate, sive præposituram cum jurisdictione ac coercitione tribuat,* πρωτοστασία *vero ut in loco quis sit prior collocatus, tantum efficit.* Προστασίαν Hesychius κυβέρνησιν interpretatur gubernationem vel administrationem. Et notum qui dicerentur proprie προστάται in Republica Athenienſium.

Well: Mr. *Hussey* will try if his Logick can help him, if his Greek cannot. *Whatsoever this person is that is to be beloved, he is supposed not instituted in this place, the subject is supposed not handled in any Science.* The like he saith afterward *pag.* 22. that we cannot prove from 1 *Cor.* 5. that *Paul* did institute excommunication, but at most that he *supposed an Institution.* For my part, that Scripture which supposeth an Institution, shall to me prove an Institution; for I am sure that which any Scripture supposeth, must be true. And herein as I take it, Mr. *Coleman* would have said as I say, for in his fourth rule he proved the Institution.

Institution of Magistracy from *Rom.* 13. yet Magistracy is not instituted in that place, but supposed to be instituted.

A third Argument I take from *Hebr.* 13. 7. *Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God*: Vers. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves: for they watch for your soules, as they that must give an account.* *Bullinger* and *Gualther* referre this 17th. verse both to *Magistracy* and *Ministery*, and so far they are ours, in sharing the rule and government between both, and in making obedience due to both. But *Calvin* and many others doe better expound the Text of Ecclesiasticall Rulers or Governours onely: wherein *Salmasius* followeth the Greek Scholiasts, who expound the Text of Bishops or Elders who did in common govern the Church. See *Walo Mess.al. pag.* 137. 138. That it is not spoken of civil but of Ecclesiastical rulers, may thus appear: beside that it were hard to take ἡγέων in the 17th. verse in another sence then it hath verse 7. or the Rulers that watch for the soule, vers. 17. to be any other, then the rulers that had spoken the Word of God, vers. 7. it is further to be noted that the Apostle speaks of such Rulers as the beleeving Hebrewes had at that time, as is evident by vers. 24. *Salute all them* (g) *that have the rule over you, and all the Saints,* and those Rulers did watch for their soules. But they had no Christian or godly Magistrates that watched for their soules, or whom the Apostle would thus salute with the Saints. But the word is ἡγεμένων saith Mr. *Hussey* pag. 18. *which is ducum, them that lead you.* The Apostle hath indeed chosen a word free of ambition, yet saith *Beza, auctoritatis maximæ*, it is a word of the greatest authority. The Syriack hath the same word here, by which he rendreth κυβερνήσεις, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. And if you consult the Septuagints, the Word ἡγέμων except very rarely where it signifieth ὁδηγὸν seu viæ ducem (and then, to speak properly, subjection and obedience is not due to the ἡγέμων) as *Exod.* 23. 23. where yet it was an Angel that was the guide, and so not without authority: they do usually and in innumerable places use this word to expresse one invested with power and authority of Government; and the same Hebrew words which they render by ἡγέμων and ἀφηγέμων, are likewise by them

(g) Aretius comment. in Hebr. 13. 14. *Primum Apostolus salutat suo nomine ipsorum præpositos, hoc est ἡγεμένες, quo nomine intelligo tum Ministros, tum etiam Seniores, qui reliquos auctoritate regebant, & in officio detinebant.*

by them translated ἡγεμὼν, δυνάστης, βασιλεὺς, σατράπης, πατριάρχης, ἄρχων, ἀρχηγὸς, στρατηγὸς, ἀρχιστρατηγὸς, ὑπατος and ἐπισκοπος; all which are names of superiority, command, and government: ὁ ἡγεμὼν *the Governour*, is *Pilates* highest Title, *Matth.* 27.2. And *Erastus*, *lib.*5. *cap.*2. pag. 312, saith, The Magistrates of the Gentiles were called by the names of ἡγεμόνες and βασιλῆς. Now ὁ ἡγούμενος and ὁ ἡγεμὼν are the same in signification. *Stephen in Thes. linguæ Gr.* citeth out of *Plutarch* ἡγέμων τῆς Γερμανίας; and tells us that ἡγεῖσθαι with a Genitive, and ἡγεῖμαι, generally is used for *præsum*. Ὁ ἡγέμων is *Josephs* greatest Title, to expresse his government over *Egypt*, *Acts* 7. 10. yea, Christ himself is called ὁ ἡγέμων, to expresse his governing or ruling power over his Church, *Matth.*2. 6. *Salmasius* doth at once shew us, both that the Apostle means the Elders of the Church under the name ἡγουμένων, and that the same name is used for civil Magistrates, yea Emperours. See *Walo Messal.* pag.219, 220. Far be it from all the Ministers of Christ, to arrogate or assume any such dominion as belongs to the civil Magistrate, or to lord it over the Lords Inheritance. Nay, here that rule must take place, *Luke* 22. 26. ὁ ἡγέμων ὡς ὁ διακονῶν, *he that is chief, as he that serveth.* Onely the holy Ghost gives to Church-officers those names of authority which are given to civil Magistrates, thereby to teach the people of God their duty, and that there is another Government beside the civil, whereunto they ought to submit and obey in the Lord.

Master *Hussey*s next answer is, that where our Books have it *Obey them that have the rule over you*, the word is πείθεσθε, which is no more but *Be perswaded.* For proof whereof, he tells us out of *Pasor*, that πείθω is *verbum forense*, a word whereby the Advocates perswade the Judges: yet we cannot say that the Judges obey the Advocates. I answer: Let him make of πείθω what he can; the passive πείθομαι, doth frequently signifie *I obey*, or *obtemper*: For which signification, *H. Stephanus* in the word πείθομαι, citeth out of *Xenophon* πείθεσθαι τοῖς ἄρχουσι: out of *Plutarch*, πείθεσθαι τῷ λιμένι: out of *Plato*, πείθεσθαι τῷ θεῷ. If we come to the Scripture-phrase, I am sure in some places πείθεσθαι signifieth a thing of another nature, then to be perswaded forensically, as *Jam.* 3. 3, *Behold, We put bits in the*

 horses

horses mouthes, that they may obey us: ὡς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν. But here when we speak of the obedience of Church-members to Church-officers, it is a free, rational, willing, Christian obedience; yet obedience it is which we owe to Spiritual Rulers, as well as that which we owe to civil Magistrates. Sure *Gualther* and *Bullinger* did understand πείθεσθε here to be more then *be perswaded*; for they apply this Text to the obedience due to Magistrates. And M. *Hussey* might have also observed that *Pasor* renders πείθομαι by *pareo*, *obedio*; for which he citeth *Gal.* 3. 1. τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι, *not to obey the truth*. And ἀπειθὴς he renders *inobediens, refractarius*, as *Rom.* 1. 30. γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, *disobedient to parents*. I know that πείθεσθαι is also used for *to be perswaded*; but I verily believe M. *Hussey* is the first man that ever quarrelled the word *obey* in this Text, and turned it to be no more but *be perswaded*. Yet if he shall well observe that which followeth in the very next words καὶ ὑπείκετε, *and submit your selves* (which in *Theodorets* opinion noteth here intense obedience: They must not onely εἴκειν, *yeeld*, but ὑπείκειν, *yeeld with subjection and submission*: This relateth to authority; nor can we say that the Judges do ὑπείκειν to the Advocates, nor travellers to their guides) he himself shall be perswaded to cast away this glosse, and to seek a better. And if he will stand to it, he shall but do a disservice to Magistracy, whiles he would weaken the power of the Ministery: for though there be much in the New Testament concerning subjection or submission to Magistrates; yet the clearest, fullest, yea (to my remembrance) the onely expresse word for obedience to Magistrates is πειθαρχεῖν, which is rightly translated in our Books *to obey Magistrates*: but Master *Hussey* will make it no more, but *to be perswaded by Magistrates*. Yea, the very simple and uncompounded Verb πείθεσθαι in the fore-cited passages of *Xenophon* and *Plutarch* is used where they speak of obedience to Magistrates and masters.

If this must fail him, he hath yet another answer: Let the word stand, saith he, as it is translated *obey*; yet it is not alway correlative to the command of a Superiour: and the holy Ghost requireth obedience here, *not by an argument from the authority of him that leadeth them, but from the benefit that cometh to themselves; for that is unprofitable for you*. He divideth what the Apo-

stle

ſtle joyneth; for there are two ſorts of Arguments in the Text, by which the Apoſtle perſwadeth them to this obedience: one is taken from the authority of the Miniſtery, which is intimated both by that name of authority ἡγουμένοι, and by their ſubordination or ſubmiſſion which the Apoſtle calls for: another from the benefit that cometh to themſelves, by their obedience, and the hurt which they ſhall do to themſelves by their diſobedience. Both theſe Arguments are wrapt up in theſe words, *For they Watch for your ſouls*, which is the very ſame with that *Acts* 20. 28. *To all the flock over the which the holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers.* The Apoſtle doth alſo perſwade Chriſtians to be ſubject to the Magiſtrate, by an Argument taken from the benefit that cometh to themſelves, *Rom.* 13. 4. *For he is the Miniſter of God to thee for good:* yet that doth not weaken but rather ſtrengthen the Authority of the Magiſtrate.

The fourth Argument ſhall be taken from 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. *Againſt an Elder receive not an accuſation, but before* (or *under*) *two or three Witneſſes.* Which is not a temporary charge laid upon *Timothy* as an Evangeliſt, and ſo incompetent to ordinary Miniſters: for it is joyned with the rules of publike Rebuking, of laying on of hands, not partaking of other mens ſins, and ſuch like things which are of ordinary concernment. He is alſo charged to keep the Commandment till the appearing of Chriſt, 1 *Tim.* 5. 14, which cannot be otherwiſe underſtood then as ſpoken to him in reference to the Miniſtery. Now what is an act of Government, if this be not, to receive accuſations, and that againſt Elders, and that under two or three witneſſes? The Apoſtle intendeth here the avoiding of theſe two evils; firſt, upon the one hand, becauſe *veritas odium parit*, and Elders doing their duty faithfully, will certainly be hated, and ſlandered, and evil ſpoken of by ſome, that therefore every *Diotrephes* pratling againſt a ſervant of Chriſt with malicious words, may not be able to blaſt his Chriſtian reputation and good name: Next, upon the other part, becauſe the offences and ſcandals of Elders are not to be connived at, but to be aggravated and cenſured, more then the offences of others, that therefore an accuſation be received againſt them, if it be under two or three witneſſes. Now where accuſations ought to be received, and that

under two or three witnesses, and not otherwise (with special charge also to observe these things, *Without partiality, or preferring one before another*, vers.21.) there is certainly a forensical proceeding, and a corrective Jurisdiction or Government. More of this Argument in *Male audis*, pag.14.

Fifthly, what is that else but a corrective Jurisdiction, *Tit.3.* 10. *A man that is an heretick, after the first and second admonition, reject,* παραιτοῦ. He speaks of a rejecting of persons, not of things onely; and of such a rejecting of persons, as cannot be understood onely of that avoiding or rejecting, by which every private Christian ought to observe, and avoid, and not receive false Teachers, but of a publike Ministerial or Consistorial rejecting of an Heretick, by cutting him off, or casting him out of the Church.

It is a Canon *de Judiciis Ecclesiasticis*, saith *Tossanus* upon the the place. This the Greek will easily admit: for *Stephanus in Thesauro linguæ Gr.* tells us that παραιτέομαι or παραιτέω is used for *recuse, averse, repudio*; and citeth out of *Plutarch* παρὰ τοῦτον τὸν γυναῖκα, *to repudiate or put away a Wife.* As here also we may read, *A man that is an Heretick, after the first and second admonition, repudiate* or *put away*; though the word *reject* doth also bear the same sence. And as the Greek will admit it, so I have these reasons to confirm it, which shall suffice for the present. (He that pleaseth, may read a large Discourse concerning the censure of Hereticks, in *Claudius Espencæus* upon this place.) First, The Apostles scope is not to hold forth the common duties of all Christians, except *ex consequenti*: but his primary intention all along in that Epistle, is to instruct *Titus* concerning the ordering and governing of the Church, *Chap.1. vers.* 5. Secondly, there must be a first and second admonition, before the Heretick be thus rejected. This rejecting is not for his dangerous and false Doctrine, simply or by it self considered, but for his contumacy and incorrigibleness. But private Christians ought to observe by the judgement of private discretion, and ought in prudence and caution to avoid all familiar fellowship and conversation with a man that is an Heretick, though he hath not yet gotten a first and second admonition: *Matth.7.15,16. Beware of false Prophets which come to you in sheeps clothing, but inward-*

inwardly they are ravening Wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Thirdly, the admonition in the Text is a publike authoritative or ministerial admonition, *after that thou* (Titus) *hast once and again admonished him* saith the Syriack: therefore the rejecting must also be publick and ministerial. Fourthly, (h) This rejecting of an Heretick is the last act, when he appears incorrigible. We find before *chap. 1. vers. 13. Rebuke them sharply*; and *chap. 2. vers. 15. Rebuke with all authority.* But now when the Apostle saith παραιτοῦ *reject*, this is a higher degree, and this (much more) must be *with all authority*, μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς, which words compare with 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. where the Apostle opposeth ἐπιταγὴν & γνώμην, *commandement*, and *opinion* or *judgement*. From all which it will appear, that this rejecting of an Heretick by *Titus* and others joyned with him in the Government of the Church, was an authoritative and Juridical act, and the judgement thereupon decisive, not consultative onely. Fifthly, Look by what authority Elders were ordained, by the same authority they were for heresie (maintained with contumacy) rejected: for the Apostle committeth into the same hands, the ordaining of Elders, and the rejecting of Hereticks; compare *Tit.* 3. 10. with *Tit.* 1. 5. Now the ordination was by the Presbyterie: 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Therefore so was the rejection.

(h) Zach. Ursinus Tom. 3. pag. 769. Object. 1. *Tantum præcipit ministro ut eum fugiat ergo non excommunicandus.* Resp. *Negatur antecedens quia non vult de una & eadem re, vel persona, contraria judicia esse aut pugnantes sententias. Ergo dum vult ut Hæreticum pro everso habeat minister, non vult ut reliqui in Ecclesia habeant eum pro stante.* Object. 2. *Sed non jubet excommunicari.* Resp. *Jubet, quia vult illum pro everso & suopte judicio condemnato haberi. Ergo non est Ecclesiæ membrum, & alibi docet judicium hoc debere fieri ordinario & legitimo consensu Ecclesiæ.*

I conclude with the Dutch Annotations upon *Tit.* 3. 10. *reject. i. e. Have no communion with him. Let him go without disputing any further with him, and casting the holy things before such dogs. Matth.* 7. 6. *Let him not remain in the outward communion of the Church.*

The sixth Argument I draw from 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. *Do not ye judge them that are within? Vers.* 13. *Therefore put away from among your selves that wicked person.* 2 Cor. 2. 6. *Sufficient to such a man is this punishment* (or *censure*) *which was inflicted of many.* Here is an Ecclesiastical judging, not by the judgement of private Christian discretion onely (for so they judged those

also that were without) but an authoritative corrective Judgement, by which a scandalous brother, a rotten member, like to infect other members, is put away from among the people of God. And this Judgement was made, sentence given, and censure inflicted ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, by many, that is not by all, but by the Elders of that Church saith *Walæus, Tom.* 1. *pag.* 468. or you may read *by the chiefest*; So *Piscator* and *Heinsius* upon the place. The sence is all one, as if the Apostle had said ὑπὸ τῶν ἡγεμόνων, *by them that have the rule over you.* Now what will you make of judging, putting away, and censuring, being acts neither of a civil power, nor put forth upon any except Church-members, if you make it not a corrective Church-government?

As for Mr. *Colemans* answer that ἐπιπμία amounts to no more but an objurgation, I have fully confuted that in *Male audis* pag. 12. 13. 14. which I will not resume. But beside all I said there, I add somewhat which I have since observed. *Zonaras in Conc. Antioch. can.* 22. useth ἐπιπμᾶσθαι for *to be punished or censured:* and *in Conc. Carthag. can.* 49. he calls the man who is under Church-censure, ὁ ἐπιπμώδεις. *Balsamon in Conc. Carthag. can.* 46. calls him ὁ ἐπιτετιμημένος. Both of them do often use ἐπιτίμιον for Church-censure, as in the place last cited, τὰ κανονικὰ ἐπιτίμια. Yea the Councell of *Antioch* held under *Constantius*, useth *Pauls* word ἐπιπμία to expresse Ecclesiasticall censure, and an act of corrective government. *Can.* 3. It is said of him that receiveth a Presbyter or Deacon being justly deposed, κἀκεῖνον ἐπιπμίας τυγχάνειν ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου ὡς ἀθρανύοντα τοὺς θεσμοὺς τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς, *ille quoq; à communi Synodo puniatur, ut qui Ecclesiastica statuta dissolvat. Ibid. Can.* 22. A Bishop is prohibit to ordain within the charge of another Bishop, unlesse that other Bishop consent. But if any presume to do such a thing, let the ordination be void or null, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιπμίας ὑπὸ τῆς συνόδου τυγχάνειν, *& ipse a Synodo puniatur, and let himself be punished by the Synod:* ὅπως κολάζονται saith *Balsamen*, *how they should be punished* who ordain without the bounds of their owne charge, and without consent of him whose charge it is, may be learned from other Canons. Where you see he understands ἐπιπμία to agree in signification with κόλασις, which is

punishment.

Punishment. The sixth general Councel *Can.* 60. useth the verb ἐπιτιμᾶσθαι for suffering punishment, adding also by way of explanation σκληραγωγίαις καὶ πόνοις ὑποβάλλειν, *to be subject to afflictions and labours.*

Seventhly, We have an Argument from 1 *Cor.* 14. 32, 33. *And the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets; for God is not the Author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints.* The Apostle is giving such rules and directions concerning prophecying or interpretation of Scripture, that upon the one hand there may be a liberty to all the Prophets to prophecy, and that the Church may be edified by the gifts of all, and that for that end one ought to give place to another: upon the other hand, that a boundlesse liberty and confusion, and immunity from censure, may not be introduced into the Church: To this latter branch belongs vers. 29. 32. 33. *Let the Prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.* He will have two, or at most three Prophets to speak in one Congregation, at one diet or time of assembling: and those Prophets, saith he, must be (i) examined, judged, and censured by the other Prophets: for the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets, that is, every particular Prophet distributively, is subject to all the Prophets collectively, or to the colledge of Prophets (add, and of other spirituall persons intrusted with the government of the Church, together with the Prophets, as from *vers.* 37. and *Gal.* 6. 1. is well observed by our Country-man Mr. *Dickson* upon this place) Therefore *Walæus Tom.* 1 pag. 468. doth rightly collect from this place an authority of Church-Government. Protestant Writers prove hence the authority of General-Councels above the Pope: and that the Pope is a false Prophet, because he refuseth to be subject to the Prophets. *Junius* in divers places, applieth this Text to the authority of Presbyteries and Synods. *Gualther* upon the place applyeth it against the Pope who will judge all men, and be judged of no man; whereas (saith he) the Apostle here will have no man how eminent soever, to be free from censure, when he is censurable. So then we have in this Text a subjection, and an authority of judging and censuring. And this Judgement which the Apostle here speaks of, is neither the Judgement

(i) Ægid. Hunnius in 1 Cor. 14. 32. *Paulus hanc regulam præscribit, ut spiritus Prophetarum Prophetis subjiciantur, id est ut is qui prophetat, non dubitet, sermonem & concionem suam censuræ judicioque reliquorum concionatorum subjicere.*

ment of the civil Magistrate, nor the Judgement of discretion common to the whole Church, but it is the Judgement or censure of Prophets, and that not School-wise according to Mr. *Hussey's* notion of Schooles, that is by the Prophets disputing a man out of his error, and no more, no vote, no decision, no result, except he that hath taught an error do agree to the arguments of the other Prophets, and so all *end in a brotherly accord*, and in the *unanimous consent of the whole Clergy* (for so doth he advise the Parliament) so that he shall be no more subject to all the Prophets, then all the Prophets to him. Yea in Mr. *Hussey's* sence the Pope will not refuse to be subject to a Councel of Prophets, and then Protestant Writers have been far out of their way, who have disputed against the Pope from this Text, supposing it to hold forth a binding authoritative Judgement of the Prophets, whereunto any one Prophet is bound to be subject, the Judgement of his private discretion being alwaies reserved to him, that he give not blind obedience.

Eighthly, I argue from *Revel.* 2. 14. 20. The Lord Jesus reproveth the Angel of the Church in *Pergamus* for suffering those that taught the doctrine of *Balaam*, and the Angel of the Church in *Thyatira* for suffering *Jezebel* which called her self a Propheteesse, to seduce his people. The fault here reproved must be the neglect of Church-censures and corrective government, which is so manifest, that they who plead most for liberty of Conscience from the Magistrate, do acknowledge that the Angels of these Churches are reproved for not censuring Ecclesiastically those that did thus seduce Gods people. Neither is it said *because thou art silent and dost not reprove nor convince*; but *because thou hast there them that hold the Doctrine of Balaam*: that is, because thou dost not cast them out of the Church, that they may not hurt others. So the English Annotations upon the place, referring us also to 1 *Cor.* 5. The Angel of the Church was guilty in this, that those who had so much scandalized the Church by their Doctrine, were still in the Church, and not yet cast out of the Church. And who can imagine that the Angels of those Churches whom Christ himself commendeth for holding fast his name, and for their love, service, faith, and patience,

patience were so void either of prudence, as not to observe, or of zeal, as not to gainsay and confute by sound doctrine those foul and scandalous errors? Certainly their sin was like that of *Eli*, they did not together with the doctrinal and monitory part, make use of that Jurisdiction and corrective power, which God had put in their hands.

Ninthly, We have another Argument from 1 *Thess.* 3.14. *And if any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no Company with him, that he may be ashamed.* Here the Syriack helpeth us much. *And if any man obey not these words which are contained in this Epistle, let that man be separated from you, neither have company with him, that he may be ashamed. Gualther* upon the place saith, the Apostle speaks *de disciplina Ecclesiastica*, what discipline they ought to have in the Church, and the end thereof. So *Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Zanchius, Diodati*, The Dutch Annotations, *Gomarus*, also *Mariana, Cajetan, Salmeron, Gorranus, Esthius in lib.* 4. *Sent. Dist.* 19. *Sect.* 7. and diverse others following *Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostome, Theophylact, Theodoret, Aquinas*, all these do apply it to Ecclesiasticall discipline and censure. Some controversie there is whether this Text reach as far as Excommunication (which doth not belong to this present Argument) but certainly it reacheth to a publick Church-censure, and is more then the withdrawing of private Company and Fellowship, either because of personal or private injuries, or because of prophanesse. For 1. the offence spoken of by the Apostle is not a matter of Civil or Personal injury, but of scandal; he speaks of idle bodies that walked disorderly, not working at all, and if these must be noted and separated, how much more saith *Theoylact.* those who commit crimes and wickednesse? 2. Here is contumacy added to the offence, *if any man obey not our word by this Epistle*, intimating that upon occasion of this Epistle, those that walked disorderly were to be solemnly admonished, and required to work in quietnesse, and to eat their owne bread: which if after admonition they would not do, then to note them. *Aquinas* clears it by 1 *Sam.* 15.23. *for rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornesse is as iniquity and as idolatry.* 3. σημειοῦσθε, *note* that man: *signate* (as *Menochius* rendreth it) rather then either

either *ſignificate* or *notate*: ſet a mark upon him, even as (ſaith *Eraſmus*) we ſet a mark upon puſhing oxen that we may avoid them; which agreeth well with the Syriack, *Let that man be ſeparated from you*: σημειόω is ſomewhat more then σημαίνω, The latter uſually ſignifieth no more, but *ſignifico*, *indico*, *ſignum do*: but the former is *ſignum & notam imprimo, obſigno, inſignio.* The Septuagints make σημειόω to anſwer to the Hebrew נָסַס and נָשָׂא, *levavit*, *elevavit*, *ſuſtulit*, So *Pſal.* 4. 7. ἐσημειώθη ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ φῶς &c. *ſignatum eſt ſuper nos*: that is, *the light of thy countenance is lifted up upon us exemplarly*, or *banner-wiſe*, ſo as it may be remarkeable to others. The learned Authors of the Dutch Annotations upon 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. tell us that *this Greek word doth not properly ſignifie to preſent or repreſent one, but to note one and mark him out, putting ſome ignominy upon him, or outing him from an honourable Congregation, and marking or blotting out his name, as one unworthy of that honour.* By which reaſon, as likewiſe by that which followes, they confute thoſe who conſtrue the word *note* with the Word *Epiſtle*, as if the Apoſtle had ſaid, note or preſent me ſuch a one by a letter. 4. *Have no company with him.* He ſpeaks it to the ἵνα τοῦτο that they may have no fellowſhip with the ἄτακτοι, he will have thoſe that walk orderly and by rule, to have no company with thoſe that walk diſorderly. Now this concerneth the whole Church equally, and it is ſpoken to the Church, for what reaſon can there be that ſome in the Church ſhould have no company with one, becauſe of his ſcandalous and diſorderly walking, but the ſame reaſon will make the whole Church to have no company with him? there may be divers civil reſpects and conſiderations which may make it unfit for ſome to keep familiar civil fellowſhip, which reſpects and conſiderations do not concern others. But the avoyding of the company of thoſe who walk ſcandalouſly and diſorderly, and that becauſe they walk in that manner, and further adde obſtinacy to their ſin after publike admonition; muſt needs belong to the whole Church. 5. *Note that man and have no company with him*; he muſt firſt be noted, before he be avoyded, and both theſe are publick Eccleſiaſtical acts: for it was far from the Apoſtles meaning that every man ſhould be herein left to his

his liberty; he that pleaseth to note him and have no company with him, well and good; he that pleaseth not, shall be free. But unlesse there be an Ecclesiastical Judgement and censure past upon such a one, every one had been left to his liberty. 6. *That he may be ashamed*: this as it is the end of Church-censures, so it will be attained in a very small measure, and perhaps not at all, by one private man his avoyding the company of another, which will not make the offender ashamed, abased, and humbled, but when he is publikely noted, and when the Church avoids his Company, that is it which most covers a man with shame and confusion of face.

Tenthly, The Apostle mentioneth Ecclesiastical Rulers, *Rom.* 12. 8. ὁ προϊστάμενος, *præfectus*, or *qui præest*, *he that ruleth*, that is, the ruling Elder. He is making an enumeration of Ecclesiastical offices and administrations, and no other: So *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Piscator*, *Martyr*, *Tossanus*, *Diodati*, all upon the place, and *Junius Eccles. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1. do conceive, and the whole context and the allusion to the severall offices of severall members in the same body proveth it, and if all the rest be Ecclesiastical, why not (k) the office of ruling also, which is there mentioned? for how should civil ruling come in among the Ecclesiastical administrations, especially in those dayes when Magistrates were not Christian? *Musculus* takes the Rulers here to be Elders. *Gualther* and *Bullinger*, though they make this Text applicable to civil Rulers, yet they do not exclude Church-officers from ruling, but expressely mention Church-Governours distinct from civil Governours, to be there comprehended under ὁ προϊστάμενος. Mr. *Hussey* pag. 19. answering this argument, can neither deny what I said of *Gualther* and *Bullinger*, nor yet doth affirm that civil Rulers are there meant, onely his reply is that my argument is drawn from the interpretation of the place, but *the Disputant may not interpret* saith he, *that is the answerers part*: This calls to mind the Anabaptistical error, *Concionatores non retinent verba Textus, sed interpretantur ea, id quod non ferendum.* For which see *Pe-*

(k) Musculus *upon the place. Habet Ecclesia quælibet suos præfectos & Gubernatores &c. Isti sunt Seniores &c.* Calv. ibid. *Temporis illius conditio non de quibuslibet præfectis Paulum loqui ostendit, (quia tunc nulli erant pii Magistratus) sed de Senioribus qui morum erant Censores.* Tossanus ibid. *Id omne ad regimen & ordinem Ecclesiæ & potestatem illam spiritualem de qua* 2 Cor. 10. *referri debet: & tribuitur præsidum appellatio quos* προϊσταμένους *& quos* ποιμένας *vocat Apostolus* 1 Tim. 5. *omnibus in genere ministris & etiam senioribus Ecclesiæ.*

trus Hinkelmannus de Anabaptismo, Disp. 9 cap. 1. My Argument was drawn from the Text, for the Text rightly understood and interpreted, is the Text. But see now what strange rules you may expect when Mr. *Hussey* comes to School-disputes, the disputant may not interpret, he must keep close to termes, if the thing be not *in terminis* in the Text, its no Argument, by which rule he will at one dash overthrow not onely the disputations of Protestants against Papists; of the ancient Fathers against the Hereticks of their times (for how is Justification by Faith ONELY, the number of the Sacraments, the consubstantiality of the Sonne with the Father, and many other most materiall points proved, but by Scripture rightly opened, cleared, and interpreted?) but also the disputations of the Apostles, and of Jesus Christ himself against the Pharisees, Sadduces, and Jewes; for there is nothing more ordinary with Christ and his Apostles in their disputes for the truth, then to interpret Scripture, and give the sence of it.

Eleventhly, Κυβερνήσεις the Governments mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. are not Civil but Ecclesiastical Governments, as I have largely proved Chap. 6. and shall not need here to repeat it; onely observe what (1) *Bullinger* saith on the place: whereunto add the Testimony of *Hugo Grotius* (whom I suppose our opposites do not look upon as an adversary) on *Luke* 12. 14. He acknowledgeth that in the Church of *Corinth*, *censura morum* was *penes Presbyterium*, the censure of mens manners, was in the power of the Presbytery. This Government the Church of *Corinth* had, a Christian Magistrate they had not.

(1) *At Gubernatores vocavit Ambrosius qui spiritualibus retinaculis documento sunt hominibus, quales sunt seniores, Presbyteri, & disciplinæ Christianæ præfecti, morum censores.*

Twelfthly, If in the Jewish Church there was an Ecclesiastical Government, distinct from the Civil; then in the Christian Church also there ought to be an Ecclesiastical Government distinct from the Civil. But in the Jewish Church there was an Ecclesiastical Government distinct from the Civil. *Ergo.*

The Proposition is proved thus. There can be no reason given for an Ecclesiastical government among the Jews, distinct from the Civil, which will not hold as well and as strongly for an Ecclesiastical government among Christians, distinct from the

the Civil: for we speak not now of the particulars (a high Priest, or the like) which were typical and proper to that time, but we speak of a Church government distinct from the Civil, look upon it under that notion, and then see if any reason can be given for it among them, which will not conclude the like among us: yea much more among us, for if the Priests had a great influence and interest into the Civil Government of the Jewes, and yet there was a Church-government distinct from the Civil; how much more now when Ministers have not, neither ought to have any share in the Civil government? The assumption hath been abundantly proved before in the first book. I will not repeat, but here note these Scriptures: *Jer.* 5. 31. *The Prophets bear rule*: It was their office to bear rule, It was their sin to support themselves in their ruling by the false Prophets. 1 *Chron.* 9. 11. *Azariah, the Ruler of the House of God.* 2 *Chron.* 31. 13. *And Azariah the Ruler of the House of God.* *Nehem.* 11. 11. *Serajah the Ruler of the House of God.* All the chief Priests or heads of the several Classes or Orders of Priests were called *Principes Sanctuarii* saith *Matthias Martinius Lexic. Philol. pag.* 3268. So 2. *Chron.* 35. 8. *Hilkiah and Zachariah, and Jehiel, Rulers of the House of God.* *Act.* 23. 5. *Then said Paul, I wist not brethren that he was the high Priest, for it is Written thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy people.* Finally, *Deut.* 31. 28. where we find *schoterim*, that is *Officers, Rulers*, or *such as were set over the charge*; the 70. read γραμματεις παιδαγωγεις, *Hierome, Doctores.* More plainly 2 *Kings* 11. 18. *the Priest appointed Officers over the House of the Lord.*

Thirteenthly, A corrective Ecclesiastical government in the Churches of *Galatia* seemeth to be intimated, *Gal.* 5. 12. *I would they were even cut off* (ἀποκόψονται) *which trouble you.* Which many understand of Excommunication. See *Esthius in lib.* 4. *Sent. Dist.* 19. *Sect.* 6. 7. Also *Salmeron, Menochius, Vasquez, Novarinus*, and (of ours) *Beza, Diodati, Gomarus*, all upon the place, beside diverse others. *Musculus* upon the place doth paralell this cutting off, with delivering to Sathan, 1. *Cor.* 5. 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. and explaineth *excindantur* by *abalienentur* which best suteth to excommunication. Certainly the words will easily admit this sence, or rather invite to it: for

ἀποκόπτω is not properly *perdo, destruo, consumo*, but *amputo, abscindo*, also *minuo*, because that from which any thing is cut off, is diminished and made lesse: also *repello, abjungo, separo, abstraho*. And so ἀποκόπτομαι, *abscindor, excindor, separor, abstrahor*. Hunters and such as trace the Vestigies, but cannot find them, are said ἀποκοπῆναι, to be cut off or abstracted. *Hesych.* ἀποκοπῆναι ἐπὶ τῶν ἰχνευόντων λέγεται ὅταν μὴ ἕυρωσιν. So ἀπόκοπος, *abscissus*, is not he who is cut off by death or destruction, but he that hath his members cut off: Which seems to have been the ground of *Augustine* his mistake of this Text, conceiving the Apostles wish to be, that those men should be made Eunuchs. The Septuagints have sometimes περιτέμνω, *circumcido*, and καταπάω, *demitto*, as synonymous with ἀποκόπτω. Now from the phrase, to the purpose of the Text. That it is meant of Excommunication, I have these reasons which confirme me: 1. Because *vers. 9. a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*, are the very same words which he useth 1 *Cor.* 5. 6. where he presseth the excommunication of the incestuous man; as there, one unclean person in life; so here, some few seducers (especially that one who is singularly pointed at vers. 10.) is meant by the *little leaven*, which was to be purged out, lest it should leaven the whole Church. 2. Interpreters do generally agree, that the Apostle here alludeth to Circumcision, which those Judaizing teachers pressed upon the *Galatians* as necessary: wishing that they who would so fain have the *Galatians* circumcised, were themselves cut off and cast out of the Church as rotten members, or as a Gangren out of the body. This allusion suteth best with excommunication. 3. The words so understood will more fitly answer and be paralel unto the cutting off in the Law, *that soul shall be cut off from among his people* (which I have before proved to be meant of excommunication) as likewise to that 1 *Cor.* 5. 14. *Put away that wicked person from among you.* 4. Other Interpretations do not so well agree to the Text. This cutting off could not be expected nor any hopes had of it by the hand of Justice, or of the Magistrate, for the Magistrates of that time were themselves troublers of the Christians, so far they were from cutting of those that troubled them. Those that understand the words of an imprecation of eternal cutting off from God,

and

and being accurſed from Chriſt, draw themſelves into thorny queſtions, wherein they can hardly ſatisfie themſelves or others. To underſtand it of cutting off by death, doth not well anſwer that alluſion to Circumciſion, generally obſerved (as hath been ſaid) by Interpreters: which alluſion doth intimate that it is not a cutting off out of the World, but a cutting off from the body of the Church. I would that they themſelves were cut off as the *præputium* from the Church, that is, cut off *à conſortio Eccleſiæ* ſaith *Gualther*. If it be ſaid, why then doth the Apoſtle onely wiſh it? Why doth he not preſcribe or command to excommunicate them? To this we may either anſwer as *Beza*, The Apoſtle *Pauls* authority at that time was extreamly blaſted and weakned in the Churches of *Galatia*; Or thus, the Apoſtle knew that as the Churches of *Galatia* then ſtood affected (being bewitched with the Judaizing Zealots, and in a manner moved away to another Goſpel) both Churches and Miniſtery were unwilling to excommunicate thoſe that he means of: for which cauſe he would not peremptorily command their excommunication, *renitente Eccleſiâ*, but forbeareth for that ſeaſon, wiſhing for better times. Some think that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh poſitively of excommunication, *verſ.* 10. *He ſhall bear his Judgement*. But others are of opinion the Apoſtle there ſpeaks of the judgement of God, which he certainly and poſitively denounces, and that *verſ.* 12. he addeth this as a diſtinct purpoſe, that he could wiſh them alſo cut off from the Church by excommunication.

It will be an Argument of more weight againſt *Eraſtus* his Interpretation of that Text, if we object againſt him thus. This cutting off which the Apoſtle wiſheth to thoſe that troubled the *Galatians*, cannot be meant of a divine or miraculous judgement upon them, ſuch as he thinks to be meant 1 *Cor.* 5. (which place he parallels with *Gal.* 5. 12. as to the puniſhment intended) for if ſo, why doth not the Apoſtle adjudge them poſitively to be cut off or deſtroyed, as he did conſtitute and decree by his Apoſtolical power of miracles (ſo thinks *Eraſtus*) the inceſtuous *Corinthian* to be delivered to Satan? To this *Eraſtus* replieth, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 9, Becauſe the Apoſtles had not power to work miracles *quoties vellent*, as often as they would, nor to afflict

flict or slay any, but when it seemed good in Gods eyes, *sed quando Deo visum fuit utile, necessarium, & salutare.* But I ask, Was it right and agreeable to the will of God, that the Apostle should wish their cutting off? Was it not profitable and necessary for the Churches good, that they should be cut off? Where shall we finde that the working of a miracle was profitable and necessary for the Churches good, and that an Apostle did desire and thirst after the working of that miracle, and yet had not power from God to work it? How had the false Apostles insulted at this? Is this the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who hath not power from God to work a miracle, when himself professeth he would gladly have it wrought?

Fourteenthly, that passage, 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. is by some brought (not without very considerable Reasons) for the Spiritual or Ecclesiastical censures. *And have in readinesse*, saith the Apostle, or (as the Syriack, *We are ready*) *to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled. Novarinus in* 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. *plerique de excommunicandi potestate hæc verba interpretantur.* In this sence was the Text understood a thousand yeers ago by *Gegrory Epist. lib.* 2. *cap.* 37. The Dutch Annotations upon the place, say that the Apostles meaning is; *of declaring the vengeance of God against the obstinate; and of exercising the Ecclesiastical Banne or Discipline, against those who professing themselves members of the Congregation, do yet teach or lead unchristian lives or doctrine.* Others also (among whom is Master *David Dickson*) understand Church-censures to be here meant. The Apostle is in that Chapter confuting the calumny of such as said of him, His Epistles were weighty and powerful, and did speak of great things; but when he himself is bodily present, he doth but little, he assumes no great authority, he is weak and almost contemptible. In answer hereunto, he tells them, *The weapons of our warfare* (speaking not onely in his own name, but in the name of all the Ministers of Christ) though they be not carnal, yet they *are mighty through God* to conquer and captivate souls to the obedience of Christ. And as for the stubborn and unruly, we are armed with a power of corrective government, which shall be more fully executed in due time. There is but one of two Interpretations which can with any probability seem to agree

ot

to this Text, namely, that it is meant either of the extraordinary Apostolical power, by which they did miraculously punish some offenders (as *Peter* did *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and as *Paul* did *Elymas*) or of a corrective Church-government, and Excommunication. The Reasons which induce me to believe, that the Apostle meaneth here of Church-censures, especially Excommunication, and not of that extraordinary miraculous power, are these. 1. The reason added, *When your obedience is fulfilled*, cannot suit to the power of working miracles (for it had been the more seasonable to work such miracles, while the obedience of the *Corinthians* was not yet fulfilled. Miracles are not for them that believe, but for them that believe not, saith the same Apostle.) But it suits very well to the power of Church-censures: for as *Esthius* and *Novarinus* explain the Apostles reason, it is in vain to excommunicate all such as are worthy of Excommunication, when there is a general reniteney and unwillingness in the Church; or to cut off a member, when the same evil hath infected either the whole or the greatest part of the body; which *Augustine* also tells us in divers places. And this (by the way) confirms the reason which I gave why the Apostle only wisheth those that troubled the *Galatians* to be cut off, but doth not command it, in regard of the present unwillingness and disaffection of those Churches. 2. We may have a great deal of light to this place by comparing it with *Chap.* 12. *verse* 20, 21. and *Chap.* 13. *verse* 2. Many among the *Corinthians* had sinned foul and scandalous sins, whereof they had not repented, and for which they were not censured or cast out of the Church. The Apostle certifieth them, that if he come, he will not spare. What? was it his meaning to work a miracle upon every fornicator, and each other scandalous person in the Church of *Corinth?* No sure: mark his words; *Now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to ALL OTHER, that if I come again, I will not spare.* Who can imagine his meaning to be, that he would work a miracle upon them and all other? So here when it is said, *having in readiness to revenge ALL disobedience*, let it be remembred that the Apostolical power of miracles was never appointed to be executed against ALL disobedience. Thirdly,

that which the Apostle saith of the Spiritual weapons, *mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds*, &c. was not proper or peculiar to the Apostles, but is rightly applied to all the Ministers of the Gospel: the more hardly can it be supposed, that what is immediately added, and as it were with one breath uttered, *And having in readinesse to revenge all disobedience*, is meant of the extraordinary Apostolical power. Fourthly, such as the weapons are for conquering and subduing souls to the obedience of Christ, such is the corrective or punitive part there spoken of. But the weapons for conquering, are meerly Spiritual, not corporal: Therefore the corrective or punitive part there spoken of, is also Spiritual, and so doth not concern the inflicting of corporal punishment, such as the *Erastians* understand by delivering to Satan.

Fifteenthly, an Ecclesiastical ruling power may be proved from 2 *Cor.* 2. 8. *I beseech you that you would confirm your love towards him.* Here is a Juridical power of loosing, and consequently of binding; for it belongeth to the same power to binde and loose, to excommunicate and to absolve. An authoritative juridical loosing, I prove from the word κυρῶσαι, which properly signifieth the making a thing sure or firm by a decisive suffrage, authoritative judgement, or ratificatory and obligatory sentence past upon it. *Hen. Stephanus in Thes. linguæ Gr.* in the word κυρόω, saith that this Text 2 *Cor.* 2. 8. is more rightly read, *Ut ratam faciatis in illum charitatem*, then as the vulgar Latin hath it, *Ut confirmetis*. The Verb κυρόω he expoundeth thus; *Auctoritatem do, auctoritate mea comprobo; vel ratum habeo, ratum facio. Pasor* renders the same Verb *fancio, ratum facio*, and citeth for that sence, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. So *Erasmus* likewise upon the place. So *Cartwright* upon the same place against the *Rhemists*. So *Chemnitius Exam. Conc. Trident. part.* 4. *de Indulg. pag.* 53. The force of this word κυρῶσαι was urged against the opinion of *Erastus* in a publike Dispute at *Heydelberg*; the narration whereof is left by *Ursinus* in his Catechetical explications. That the word signifieth an authoritative act, and supposeth a ruling power, may be thus further confirmed. First, who did κυρῶσαι, but κυρία ἐκκλησία? No doubt the Apostle borroweth the word from the language and customs of the Heathen

Heathen Greeks. Now κυρία ἐκκλησία was a fixed or set lawful Assembly, which met with a judicial ruling power, and ratified a thing by decisive suffrages, ἐκύρων τὰ ψηφίσματα. See *Suidas* in the word ἐκκλησία, *Stephanus* and *Scapula* in the word κύριος; *Erasmus* in 2 *Cor.* 2. 8. *Arias Montanus* in the word κυρία, tells us that to the Græcians κυρία was the same thing, which *Comitia* to the Latines: Therefore such Assemblies had a judicial power, and their suffrages were κύριαι ψῆφοι, firm and ratified Sentences. Secondly, κυρόω commeth from κῦρος, whence also cometh κύριος *Lord*, κυριότης *dominion*, κυριεύω *to rule*, or to have a dominion: It was long ago observed by *Dionysius Areopagita*, *de divinis nominibus*, *cap.* 12. where after he hath put into the description of κυριότης *dominion*, that it is ἀληθὴς καὶ ἀμετάπτωτος βεβαιότης, *true and unshaken firmnesse*, he addes this reason, διὸ καὶ κυριότης πρὸς τὸ κῦρος, καὶ τὸ κύριον, καὶ τὸ κυριεῦον. Which *Balthasar Corderius* rendereth thus: *Quapropter dominatio Græcè à* κῦρος *derivato nomine, idem est quod firmatio, firmamentum & firmum, ac firmans seu ratificans.* *Pachimeres* in his Paraphrase addeth that κυριότης as it signifieth ἐξουσία, hath its name from κῦρος. So then it is not every confirming, certifying, or making sure a thing, but when a thing is made sure or firm with fulnesse of authority and power. The word κῦρος is therefore rightly rendred by *Stephanus*, *Scapula* and *Pasor*, not onely *firmamentum, rata fides*, but *auctoritas plena*, full authority. Thirdly, the same Apostle calls a ratified Testament (which ratification is by a legal and judicial authority) διαθήκην κεκυρωμένην, *Gal.* 3. 15. Fourthly, the opposite Verb ἀκυρόω signifieth *auctoritate privo, omni imperio spolio. irritum reddo.* As ἀκυρόω noteth a privation of authority, so κυρόω a giving of authority or ratification.

The sixteenth Argument to prove a distinct Church-Government, is this. The visible political ministerial Church is the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and he is the Head, King, Judge, and Law-giver thereof, *Isa.* 9. 6. *Isa.* 22. 21, 22. *Psal.* 2. 6. *Luk.* 1. 33. 1 *Cor.* 15. 24. *Eph.* 1. 21, 22, 23. Dare any say that the Lord Jesus shall not governe the Church of *England*, and reigne over the same? *Luk.* 19. 14. 27. Must he not be received both as Lord and as Christ? *Acts* 2. 36. Now in the administration and government of a Kingdom these three things are ne-

cessarily required. 1. Lawes. 2. Officers, Ministers, Judges, Courts. 3. Censures and punishments of offences. Which three being universally necessary in every Kingdom, can least of all be supposed to be wanting in the Church and Kingdom of Jesus Christ, who hath been more faithfull in the execution of his Kingly office, and hath provided better for the Government of his Church, then ever any King or State in this world did for a Civil Government. I adde the Lawes, Judicatories, and censures in the Kingdom of Christ must be spiritual and Ecclesiastical, because his Kingdom is not of this world, and his servants cannot take the sword, *John* 18. 36. Neither are the weapons of our warfarre carnal, but yet mighty through God, and in readinesse to revenge all disobedience: 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. 6. I do not see what can be answerd to this Argument, except any do so far deny the Kingly office of Jesus Christ, as to say that the Church Political or Ministerial is not his Kingdom; but onely the Church Mystical; that is, as he ruleth over our soules by his Word and Spirit. To which purpose Mr. *Hussey* in his *plea* pag. 33. denyeth that the visible Church can be called the Body of Christ, or he their Head; and tells us that the government which Christ hath over the faithful, is truely spiritual, *and of this Kingdom* saith he, *he hath indeed no Officers but his Spirit.* I reply, 1. The Scripture is plain that a visible ministeriall Church is the body of Christ, *Rom.* 12. 4, 5. 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 17. 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. to 28. If we admit of a visible Church and visible Saints, we must also admit of a visible body, and a visible Kingdom of Christ. 2. The Political Ministerial Church were a body without a head. The Analogie of a political head as well as of a natural head agreeth to Christ: the πολιτία, as well as ἐνέργεια: and he hath an influence upon the Church *potestative* as well as *effective.* 3. He executeth his Propheticall office not onely in teaching us inwardly by his Spirit, but in teaching the Church outwardly by his servants the Ministers of his Word: Now if he be a Prophet to the visible ministerial Church, he is also a King to the same; for his offices cannot be divided, his Scholars are his Subjects, and whosoever receive him as a Prophet, must also receive him as a King. Yea, let us hear Mr. *Hussey* himself pag. 17. *The Kingdom of Christ is as ample as his Prophecy,*

Prophecy, &c. the Doctrine which they must teach commands, now commands have alwaies power and authority annexed. So that either he must say that Christ gives no commands to the visible Church, or confesse that the visible Church is the visible Kingdom of Christ. 4 That the Kingdom of Christ comprehendeth the Government and discipline of the Church, I prove from *Matth.* 16. 28. *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man comming in his Kingdom*: Where first of all note, Christ hath not onely an invisible, but a visible Kingdom; Next, this visible Kingdom is not meant of his comming again in glory to judge the quick and the dead; for all that were then hearing Christ, have tasted of death, and yet Christ is not come to judgement. Nor is it meant of Christs transfiguration mentioned *Matth.* 17. for that was six dayes after, *Matth.* 17. 1. and if he meant that, he would not have said so emphatically, *there be some here that shall not taste of death, &c.* intimating what was to come to passe, not after some daies, but after some yeares; as if he had said this age or generation shall not passe away till these things be fulfilled. Neither is that transfiguration any where called the Kingdom of God, nor can it be properly so called. Nor lastly is the Kingdom of God in that place meant onely of the preaching of the Gospel, for so they had seen Christ comming in his Kingdom. *Luk.* 10. 9. 11. Nor is it meant of Christs working of miracles, for so likewise they had seen his Kingdom. *Matth.* 12. 28. *Melius ergo Beda & Gregorius, quorum sententiam nostri sequuntur, per illud Regnum Christi intelligunt constitutionem Ecclesiarum, post Christi ascensum*, saith *Tossanus* upon the place. Some of those to whom he spoke at that time lived to see Christ reigne in the gathering and governing of Churches. *Gregor.. Hom* 32. *in Evang. Et quia nonnulli ex discipulis usq; adeo in corpore victuri erant ut Ecclesiam Dei constructam conspicerent, & contra mundi hujus gloriam erectam, consolatoria promissione nunc dicitur: Sunt quidam de hinc stantibus qui non gustabunt mortem, donec videant regnum Dei.* The very same words hath *Beda* on *Mark.* 9. 1. following (it seemes) *Gregory*. *Grotius* on *Matth.* 16. 28. doth likewise understand the promulgation of the Gospel, and the Scepter of Christ, that is, his law going out of

Zion to be here meant. I conclude, as the Church is not onely a *mystical* but a *political* body, So Christ is not onely a *mystical* but a *political* Head.

But peradventure some men will be bold to give another answer, that the Lord Jesus indeed reigneth over the Church, even in a political respect, but that the administration and influence of this his Kingly office is in, by, and through the Magistrate, who is supreme Judge, Governour, and Head of the Church under Christ. To this I answer, Hence it would follow 1. That Christs Kingdom *is of this World, and commeth with observation*, as the Kingdoms of this World do, which himself denieth *Luke* 17 20 *John* 18 36. Next, It would follow, that Christ doth not reigne nor exercise his Kingly office in the Government of his Church under Pagan, Turkish, or persecuting Princes, but onely under the Christian Magistrate, which no man dare say.

3. The Civil Magistrate is Gods Vicegerent, but not Christs: that is, the Magistrates power hath its rise, origination, institution, and deputation, not from that speciall dominion which Christ exerciseth over the Church as Mediator and Head thereof, But from that Universal Lordship and Soveraignity which God exerciseth over all men by right of Creation: In so much, that there had been (for orders sake) Magistrates or superior Powers though man had not fallen, but continued in his innocency; and now by the Law of Nature and Nations there are Magistrates among those who know nothing of Christ, and among whom Christ reigneth not as Mediator, though God reigneth over them by the Kingdom of power.

4. If the Magistrate be supreme Head and Governour of the Church under Christ, then the Ministers of the Church are the Magistrates Ministers as well as Christs, and must act in the Magistrates name, and as subordinate to him; and the Magistrate shall be Christs Minister, and act in Christs Name.

The seventeeth Argument I draw from the institution of Excommunication by Christ, *Matth.* 18. 17. *Tell it unto the Church: But if he neglect to hear the Church, Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a Publican.* In which Text 1. All is restricted to a brother, or a Church-member, and agreeth not to him

him who is no Church-member. 2. His treſpaſſe is here lookt upon under the notion of ſcandal, and of that which is alſo like to deſtroy his owne ſoule. 3. The ſcope is not civil, but ſpiritual, to gain or ſave his ſoul. 4. The proceedings are not without witneſſes. 5. There is a publick complaint made to the Church. 6. And that becauſe he appeares impenitent, after admonitions given privatly, and before two or three. 7. The Church ſpeaks and gives a Judgement concerning him, which he is bound to obey. 8. If he obey not, then he is to be eſteemed and held as a heathen man and a Publican. 9. And that for his not hearing the Church, which is a publike ſcandal concerning the whole Church. 10. Being as an Heathen and Publican, he is kept back from ſome ordinances. 11. He is bound on earth by Church-Officers. *Whatſoever ye bind, &c.* 12. He is alſo bound in Heaven. More of this place elſe-where. Theſe hints will now ſerve. The Eraſtians deny, that either the caſe, or the court, or the cenſure there mentioned is Eccleſiaſtical or Spiritual. But I prove all the three.

Firſt, *Chriſt* ſpeaketh of the caſe of ſcandals, not of perſonal or civil injuries, whereof he would be no Judge, *Luk.* 12. 14. and for which he would not permit Chriſtians to go to Law before the Roman Emperor or his deputies, 1 *Cor.* 6. 1. 6. 7. But if their interpretation ſtand, they muſt grant that Chriſt giveth laws concerning civil injuries, and that he permitteth one of his diſciples to accuſe another for a civil injury before an unbeleeving Judge. Beſide, *Chriſt* ſaith not, If he ſhall hear thee, thou haſt from him a voluntary reparation of the wrong, or ſatisfaction for it (which is the end why we deal with one who hath done us a civil injury) But he ſaith, *If he ſhall hear thee, thou haſt gained thy brother*, intimating that the offending brother is told and admoniſhed of his fault, onely for a ſpiritual end, for the good of his ſoul, and for gaining him to repentance. All which proveth that our Saviour meaneth not there of private or civil injuries, as the Eraſtians ſuppoſe, but of ſcandals, of which alſo he had ſpoken much before, as appeareth by the preceding part of that chapter. A civil injury done by one brother to another is a ſcandal, but every ſcandal is not a civil injury. The

Jews

Jewes (to whole custome *Christ* doth here allude) did excommunicate for diverse scandals which were not civil injuries. And *Paul* saith of a scandal which was not a civil injury: *when ye sin so against the brethren.* &c. 1 *Cor.* 8. 12.

2. The court is Ecclesiastical, not civil, for when it is said Tell it unto the Church, must we not expound Scripture by Scripture, and not understand the Word Church to be meant of a civil Court? for though the word ἐκκλησία is used *Act.* 19. *recitative*, of a heathenish civil assembly, called by that name among those heathens: yet the pen-men of the holy Ghost have not made choice of the Word ἐκκλησία in any place of the new Testament, to expresse a civil court either of Jewes or Christians. So that we cannot suppose that the holy Ghost speaking so as men may understand him, would have put the word ἐκκλησία in this place to signifie such a thing as no where else in the new Testament it is found to signifie. Nay, this very place expoundeth it self, for *Christ* directeth his speech to the Apostles, and in them to their Successors in the government of the Church. *Whatsoever ye shall bind &c.* And *if two of you shall agree*, &c. So that the church which here bindeth or judgeth, is an Assembly of the Apostles, Ministers, or Elders of the church.

3. The censure is spirituall, as appeareth both by these words, *Let him be unto thee as a Heathen and a Publican*; which relate to the Excommunication from the church of the Jewes, and comprehendeth not onely an exclusion from private fellowship and company (which was the condition of the Publicans, with whom the Jewes would not eat) but also an exclusion from the Temple, Sacrifices, and communion in the holy things, which was the condition of heathens, yea of prophane Publicans too: of which elsewhere. And further it appeareth by these words, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, &c.* The Apostles had no power to inflict any civil punishment, but they had power to bind the soul, and to retain the sin. *Joh.* 20. 23. And this power of binding is not in all the Scripture ascribed to the civil Magistrate.

The eighteenth Argument shall be drawn from the example of excommunication, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5. The Apostle writeth to the church of *Corinth* to deliver to Sathan (for the delivery to

to Sathan was an act of the church of *Corinth*, as the Syriack explaineth it) the incestuous man, which is called a *censure inflicted by many* 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. that is, by the whole Presbytery of the Church of *Corinth*. And whereas some understand by delivering to Sathan, the putting forth of the extraordinary Apostolicall power to the working of a miracle upon the offender, by giving him over into the hands of Sathan, so as to be bodily tormented by him, or to be killed and destroyed (as *Erastus* takes it) I answer 1. It cannot be meant of death, for it is said that *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* were delivered to Sathan, and to what end? that they might learne not to blaspheme, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. which had been too late to learn after death, 2. Nor is it at all meant of any miraculous tormenting of the body by the divel, for beside that it is not likely this miracle could have been wrought, *Paul* himself not being present to work it, it is utterly incredible that the Apostle would have so sharply rebuked the Church of *Corinth*, for that a miracle was not wrought upon the incestuous man, (it not being in their power to do:) or that he would seek the consent of that Church to the working of a miracle, and as a joynt act proceeding from him and the Church by common counsell and deliberation, for where read wee of any miracle wrought that way? Therefore it is much more safe to understand by delivering to Sathan, (as *Gualther* himself doth) Excommunication, which is a shutting out of a Church-member from the Church, whereby Sathan commeth to get dominion and power over him, for he is the God of this World, who reigneth at his pleasure in and over those who are not the Church and people of God. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Eph.* 2. 2. And if any shall be so far unsatisfied as not to admit this sence which we put upon that phrase of delivering to Sathan; Yet our Argument for Excommunication drawn from 1 *Cor.* 5. standeth strong, the weight of it not being laid upon *tradere Satanæ* onely, but upon *vers.* 6. 7. 11, 12. compared with 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. which undeniably prove Excommunication from Church fellowship.

The nineteenth Argument shall be drawn from *Act.* 20. 28. *Take heed therefore unto your selves, and to all the flock over the which the holy Ghost hath made you Overseers* ἐπισκόπους, compared

red with 1 *Pet.* 5. 2, 3. *Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof : ἐπισκοποῦντες :* Which Texts as they hold forth a Bishop and a Presbyter to be one and the same *Jure divino*, so they hold forth the ruling power of Presbyters or Elders

First, Because otherwise the *simile* (so much made use of in these Scriptures) of overseeing the flock (mentioned and joyned together with the feeding thereof) will fall short in a main and most materiall point : for the overseers of flocks do not onely make them to lye down in green pastures , and lead them beside the still waters , but they have also rodds and staves for ruling the flocks , and for correcting and reducing the wandring sheep , which will not be brought home by the voice of the shepheard , *Psal.* 23. 2. 4. The Pastorall rod there mentioned by *David* is corrective : as *Clemens Alexandrinus pedag. lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. observeth who doth also paralel it with that 1 *Cor.* 4 Shall I come unto you with a rod ?

Secondly, *Paul* requireth the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus* to take heed unto , and to oversee the whole flock, which did consist of more then did or could then meet together ordinarily into one place for the worship of God , as appeareth by the Church in the house of *Aquila* and *Priscilla* (which was one, but not the onely one Church assembly at *Ephesus*) by the great and wonderfull increase of the Gospel at *Ephesus*, and such other Arguments which I do but point at , the full debate of them not being my present work. *Peter* also writing to the Churches of the strangers in severall provinces , calls them the *flock* not *flocks*, and commends unto the Elders the feeding and oversight of that flock. Now what is it that can denominate many particular visible Churches or Congregations to be one visible ministeriall flock or Church , unless it be their union and association under one Ecclesiasticall Government ? No doubt, they had the administration of the Word and Sacraments *partitive* , or severally. Nor do I deny but they had a partitive several Government : but there was also an union or association of them under one common Government , which did denominate them to be one visible Ecclesiastical flock.

Thirdly , The very name given to the Elders of the Church,

Church, ἐπισκοποι, is a name of authority, rule, and government, especially in the Christian and Ecclesiasticall use of the Word. *H. Stephanus in Thes. ling. Gr.* in the word ἐπισκοπος, saith that the Elders of the Church were called ἐπίσκοποι, *seu ἐπιστάται καὶ ἐπόπται τῆ ποιμνίη*, to wit saith he, those *qui verbo & gubernationi præerant.* Where he tells us also that the Magistrate or Prætor who was sent with a Judiciall power into those Townes which were under the power of the *Athenians*, was called by the name of ἐπίσκοπος. The Septuagints use the word *Nehem.* 11. 9. *Joel the son of Zichri was their overseer* (ἐπίσκοπος ἐπ' αὐτῶν) *and Judah the son of Senuah was second over the City.* He that had but the second place was a Ruler, how much more he that was in the first place? Loe here, the head and chief Ruler of the Benjamites called by the name of ἐπίσκοπος. So *Numb.* 31. 14. *2 Kings* 11. 15. the chief officers of the Host, the Captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, are called by the Septuagints ἐπίσκοποι τῶν δυνάμεως. The same Hebrew words which they render by ἐπίσκοπος, they render in other places by ἐπιστάτης, *præfectus*, ἀντιστὰς, *Antistes*, προϊστὰς, *præpositus*, ἄρχων, *Princeps*: Yea the name of God פקיד they render by this word *Job.* 20. 29, *This is the portion of a wicked man from God, and the heritage appointed to him by God*, παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου saith the Greek, *by the overseer*, (even as the same name of Bishop is given to Christ, 1 *Pet.* 2. 25.) *Conradus Kircherus* in the word *Pakad*, tells us also that *Gen.* 41. 34. *Let* Pharaoh do *this, and let him appoint Officers over the Land*, where the 70. read τοπάρχας, the Greek *Scholia* which he useth to cite hath ἐπισκόπους.

Fourthly, *Peter* addeth, not as being Lords, or over-ruling κατακυριεύοντες, that we might understand he condemneth the ruling power of the Lord Bishop, not of the Lords Bishop, of *Episcopus Dominus*, not of *Episcopus Domini.* Just as *Ezek.* 34. 4. the shepheards of Israel are reproved for lording it over the flock, *with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them*, It was their duty to rule them, but it was their sin to rule them with force and with cruelty.

The twentieth Argument I take from 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. *Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of*

the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in Stewards that a man be found faithfull. And *Tit.* 1. 7. a Bishop is *the Steward of God*; θεοῦ οἰκονόμος. This name doth exclude Lordship and dominion, but withall it noteth a ministeriall rule or government, as in the proper, so in the metaphorical signification: οἰκονόμος is a name diverse times given by *Aristotle* in his Politicks to the civil Magistrate. The Septuagints have οἰκονόμοι as synonymous with στρατηγοί, σατεάπαι, τοπάρχαι. *Esther* 8. 9. *To the Lieutenants and the Deputies.* The 70. thus, τοῖς οἰκονόμοις καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι. The holy Ghost by the same word expresseth Government, *Gal.* 4. 2. ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους, *is under Tutors and Governors. Rom.* 16. 23. *Erastus* is called ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως. *Theophylact* thinks he was Governour of the City; *Erasmus* that he was *præfectus ærario*, Town-Treasurer. The English Translators call him *the Chamberlain of the City.* Yea setting aside the metaphorical signification of this name often used for a name of rule; the very literall and native signification of the word will serve to strengthen this Argument in hand. Ministers are οἰκονόμοι, that is, house stewards, or over the house; but what house? *Aristotle* at the beginning of the second book of his Oeconomicks, distinguisheth a fourfold œconomy, βασιλικὴ, σατεραπικὴ, πολιτικὴ, ἰδιωτικὴ: *kingly, noble, civil, private:* The Ministers of Christ are οἰκονόμοι of the first sort. They are stewards in the house of the great King. He that is steward in a Kings house, must needs have a ruling power in the house. 1 *Kings* 4. 6. *Ahishar was over* Solomons *household.* 1 *Kings* 18. 3. *And Ahab called Obadiah which was the Governour of his house.* 2 *Kings* 18. 18. *Eliakim which was over the household.* In all which places the 70. have οἰκονόμος. I hold therefore with (m) *Peter Martyr* upon 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. that Ministers being by their calling and office stewards in the house of God, ought to cast out prophane impure persons out of the house, and receive them again upon their repentance. And why are they called *Stewards of the mysteries of God?* surely the Sacraments are part (and a chief part) of those mysteries: and Christ hath made his Ministers (not the civil Magistrates) stewards of these mysteries, to receive unto, or to exclude from the Sacraments; and as they may not keep back any of the children of

(m) *Curabit denique (œconomus) ut impuros & perdite viventes a familia excludat, eosdemque si pœnitentiam egerint, rursus in eam recipiat.*

of the houſe, ſo they may not ſuffer dogs to eat at the childrens Table.

The one and twentieth Argument, which ſhall *claudere agmen*, ſhall be drawn from *Act.* 15. where we find an Eccleſiaſtical Aſſembly or Synod of the Apoſtles, Elders, and other choice brethren, ſuch as *Judas* and *Sylas*: Theſe did ſo aſſemble themſelves, and proceed with authority in a buſineſſe highly concerning the truth of the Goſpel, Chriſtian liberty, the healing of ſcandal, and the preſerving of peace in the Church, as that it is manifeſt they had, and executed a power of government diſtinct from Magiſtracy. *Mr. Selden de Jure natur. & Gent. lib. 7. cap.* 12. hath ſufficiently expreſſed that which is the ground of my preſent Argument: and I rather chooſe to ſpeak it in his words then in my owne, *Now a diſpute being had of this thing at Antioch, Paul and Barnabas (who having uſed many Arguments againſt that Phariſaical opinion, yet could not end the controverſie) are ſent to Hieruſalem that there the thing might be determined by the Apoſtles and Elders. It is agitated in a Synod. In it it is determined by the Apoſtles and Elders, that the Gentiles who had given their names to Chriſt, are not indeed bound by the Law of Moſes or of the Hebrewes, as it is Moſaicall and preſcribed to the Church or Common-wealth of the Jewes, but that they ought to enjoy their Chriſtian liberty.* And ſo much for that which the Synod looſed them from. But what doth the Synod bind upon them? The Synod doth alſo impoſe certain things, namely abſtinence from fornication, and from things offered to Idols, and from blood, and things ſtrangled, VT QUÆ NECESSARIO OBSERVANDA, EX AUTHORITATE SYNODI, ſaith Mr. *Selden*, BEING SUCH AS WERE NECESSARILY TO BE OBSERVED, IN REGARD OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE SYNOD, *by thoſe who giving their names to the Chriſtian Religion, ſhould live with the Jewes (they alſo giving their names to the Chriſtian Religion) and ſo enter into religious fellowſhip with them.* I ſhall adde two other Teſtimonies of Mr. *Prynns*; The firſt I ſhall take out of his *twelve conſiderable ſerious Queſtions concerning Church-Government, pag.* 5. where arguing againſt the Independency of particular Congregations, he askes, whether the *Sy-*

nodal Assembly of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at Hierusalem, Act. 15. *who* MADE AND SENT BINDING DECREES *to the Churches of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. and other Churches*, be not an apparent subversion of Independency. So that by Mr. *Prynns* confession, the Scripture holds forth other Governours or Rulers in the Church beside Magistrates, and the authority of these other Governours to be such as to make and send to the Churches BINDING DECREES in things and causes Ecclesiastical. Another Testimony I take from his *Independency examined*, pag. 10 11. where he argueth against the Independents, and proveth from *Act.* 15. the authority of ordinary Ecclesiastical Synods, bringing also six Arguments, to prove that the Apostles did not there act in their extraordinary Apostolical capacity, or as acted by a spirit of infallibility, but in their ordinary capacity. Thereafter he concludeth thus. *Therefore their assembling in this Councel, not in their extraordinary capacity, as Apostles onely, but as Elders, Ministers: and the Elders, Brethrens sitting together in Councell with them, upon this Controversie and occasion, is an undeniable Scripture authority for the lawfulnesse, use of Parliaments, Councels, Synods under the Gospel, upon all like necessary occasions: and* FOR THEIR POWER TO DETERMINE CONTROVERSIES OF RELIGION, TO MAKE CANONS IN THINGS NECESSARY FOR THE CHURCHES PEACE AND GOVERNMENT.

Loe here Mr. *Prynn* gives us an undeniable Scripture authority for a diataktick governing power in the Church, distinct from Magistracy. How he will draw from *Act.* 15. the use of Parliaments or their authority, I do not imagine: It is enough for my Argument that he acknowledgeth this Scripture to warrant Synods of Ministers and Elders, and the power of these Synods to be not onely *consultive*, but *concluſive, decisive*, and *obligatory*; for, this (I suppose) he means by the power to determine controversies, and to make Canons for the Churches peace and government: else he had concluded nothing against the Independents, who yeeld a consultive Synodicall power.

If

If any shall yet desire to be more particularly satisfied concerning the strength of my present Argument from *Act.* 15. I will make it out from these particulars following.

First, Here is a power and authority to assemble Synodically, and it is an intrinsecall power within the Church it self, not adventitious or extrinsecall from the Magistrate. Whence the soundest Protestant writers prove, that though the civil Magistrate hath a power of convocating Synods, and he ought to do it when the Churches necessity or danger doth call for such a remedy; yet this power of his is *positive*, not *privative*, *cumulative*, not *destructive*, And that *if the Magistrate be an enemy and persecuter of the Church and of true Religion, or cease to do his duty, that is to wit, in a manifest danger of the Church, the Church notwithstanding ought not to be wanting to her self, but ought to use the right and authority of convocation, which first and foremost remaineth with the Rulers of the Church; as may be seen Act.* 15. So say the Professors of *Leyden in Synops. purior. Theol. Disp.* 49. *Thes.* 24. beside diverse others whom I might here cite, but that is not now my business.

Secondly, Beside the publike debate and deliberation, the Synod did also choose and send certain delegates or commissioners to *Antioch*, and wrote by them a Synodical Epistle to the Churches in *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia*. I beleeve such Synodical acts of sending Commissioners and letters to the Churches in other Nations or Provinces, should now be lookt upon as acts of government, if done without the leave of the Magistrate, as then *Judas* and *Silas* were sent.

Thirdly, That Synod did exercise and make use of a three-fold Ecclesiastical power, for remedy of a three-fold Ecclesiastical disease. 1. They purge out the leven of false doctrine and heresie, by deciding and determining that great controversie, whether Circumcision and the keeping of the Ceremoniall Law of *Moses* were necessary to salvation. They hold forth and declare to the Churches the negative; And this they do by the *dogmatik* power. 2. There was a great scandal taken by the beleeving Jewes (then not fully instructed and perswaded concerning the abrogation of the Ceremoniall Law by the death of Christ) who were so far stumbled and offended at the beleeving Gentiles

Gentiles for their eating of things sacrificed to Idols, and of blood, and things strangled, that they could not freely nor contentedly converse, company, and eate together with the Gentiles. For remedy whereof, the Synod doth require (in regard of the law of love, edification, peace, and avoyding of scandall) that the Gentiles should abstain from those things, as also from fornication, (which for what cause it is added, I do not now dispute) And this they do by the *Diatakti*k power. 3. There was a σχίσις, a schisme, dissention, and rent made in the Church by the Judaizing Teachers, *vers.* 2. Who clothed themselves with a pretended authority and warrant from the Apostles and Elders at *Hierusalem*, and thereupon got the more following, and drew away the more disciples after them. For remedy hereof, the Synod stigmatizeth and brandeth those men, by declaring them to be lyars, troublers of the Church, and subverters of souls, *vers.* 24. And this they do by the *Critick* power, or authority of censures.

Fourthly, The decree and Canon of the Synod, which is made, imposed, emitted and promulgat, is authoritative, decisive, and binding; *Act.* 15. 28. *For it seemed good to the holy Ghost, and* (here the Arabick repeateth *it seemed good*) *to us, to lay upon you no greater burthen then these necessary things, That ye abstain &c.* If it be said that this was but a doctrinal advice. *It seemed good &c.* I answer, *Josephus Antiq. Jud. lib.* 4. *cap.* 8. speaking of the decree of the supreme Sanhedrin (which he that disobeyed was to be put to death) calls it τὸ δοκοῦν, *that which seemeth good*: So likewise in this place, the word ἔδοξε, is not meant of an Opinion onely, for an Opinion (as Schoolmen define it) is properly such a Judgement of or assent to a thing, as is evident and firme, but not certain: So that Opinion cannot be ascribed to the holy Ghost; It is therefore here a word of authority and decree: as Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critica sacra* at the word δοκέω noteth out of *Chemnitius*. In which sence the Grecians frequently use it. So *Stephanus* out of *Demosthenes*: δέδοχται τῇ βουλῇ. *It is decreed by the Senate.* And *Budæus* out of *Plato*, δέδοκταί μοι καταθανεῖν. *It is certainly appointed to die.* Observe also the word ἐπιτίθεσθαι, and βάρος, *imposing* and *burthen.* They do impose some burthen, onely

onely they are carefull to impose no burthen except in necessary things. *Acts* 16. 4 *And as they went through the Cities they delivered them τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα, the decrees that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders which were at Hierusalem.* And here I cannot passe the observation of that gentleman who hath taken so good pains in the Original Tongues, Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critica sacra* of the New Testament, on the word δόγμα: *Whereseever δόγμα is found in the New-Testament, it is put for Decrees or Lawes, as Luke* 2. 1. *Acts* 17. 7. *it is put for the Decrees of Cæsar; and Ephes.* 2. 15. *Colos.* 2. 14. *for the Ceremonial Lawes of Moses; and so frequently by the LXX. in the Old Testament for Decrees; as Dan.* 2. 13. *and* 3. 10. 29. *and* 4. 6. *for Lawes, Dan.* 6. 8. *Caterum* saith *Erasmus* upon *Act.* 16. 4. *Dogmata Græca vox est, significans & ipsa decreta sive placita, non doctrinam ut vulgus existimat.* And whereas some have objected, that δογματίζω and δογματίζομαι are used onely in reference to a doctrinal power, as *Col.* 2. 20. δογματίζεσθε. I answer, *Budæus* expounds δογματίζω to be *decerno*, and *Col.* 2. 20. δογματίζεσθε, The Syriack makes it *judicamini*; *Erasmus* and *Bullinger*, *Decretis tenemini. Stephanus*, *Beza*, and *Gualther*, *ritibus oneramini*; the English Translators, *are ye subject to Ordinances?* This subjection was not onely to *Doctrines*, but to *Commandements*, *vers.* 22. *after the Commandements and Doctrines of men*: and these commandements (though in deed and truth the commandements of men onely at that time) were imposed as the Commandements of God, and as Ceremoniall Lawes given by *Moses*. The vulgar Latine hath *decernitis*, and *Tertullian* readeth *Sententiam fertis*, both of them (it seemeth) having read δογματίζετε: however they understand the power related unto to be more then Doctrinall.

I conclude that δόγματα, *Acts* 16. 4. must be more then Doctrinal declarations, and that it is meant of binding decrees (that I may use Mr. *Prynns* phrase) especially when joyned with κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, there was a Judgement passed and given upon the making and sending of those δόγματα, not the judgement of one or two,

but the judgement of the Apostles and Elders Synodically assembled. So *Acts* 21.25. *James* and the Elders speaking of that Synodical judgement say, *we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, &c.*

These four considerations being laid together, concerning an intrinsecall Ecclesiastical power of assembling together Synodically; of choosing and sending Commissioners with a Synodical Epistle to the Churches in other parts; of providing effectual and necessary remedies both for heresies, scandals, and schismes arising in the Church; of making and imposing binding decrees on the Churches, will infallibly prove from Scripture authority another Government in the Church beside Magistracy.

I might here adde other Arguments, but so much for this time.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Some Objections made againſt Eccleſiaſtical Government and Diſcipline anſwered.

MR. *Huſſey* in his Epiſtle to my ſelfe objecteth thus: *What will your cenſure doe? it will ſhame a few Whores and knaves; a great matter to ſhame them the Law of nature ſhameth.*

All this *in terminis* might have been as juſtly objected againſt the Apoſtle *Paul*, when he wrote to the *Corinthians* to put away from among themſelves the inceſtuous man. What will your cenſure do *Paul*? a great matter to ſhame one whom the law of nature ſhameth. The Lord ſave me from that Religion which will not ſhame Whores and Theeves, and all other whom the Law of Nature ſhameth, and that in a Church way (as well as civilly) if any ſuch member fall into ſuch impiety: yet this is not all. All Orthodox Writers that write of Church-cenſures, will tell him, that ſcandalls either of Doctrine or life, either againſt the firſt or ſecond Table, fall under Eccleſiaſtical cognizance and cenſure.

Secondly, He argueth thus *Ibid. Sure in the day of our Lord there will be as good a returne of the Word preached, as of the cenſure.* And in his *plea pag.* 1. *If the Word be able to make the man of God perfect, then nothing is wanting to him*: perfectum cui nihil deeſt: *and it is a Wonder how that Conſcience ſhould be wrought upon by humane authority, with whom divine cannot prevail.*

Answ. 1. This also he might as well have objected against the Apostle *Paul*, who did require the *Corinthians* to put away from among them the incestuous man, and *Titus* to reject an Heretick after once or twice admonishing of him. 2. He might object the same thing against Magistracy. Shall there not be a better account of the word preached then of Magistracy? and if the Word be able to make the man of God perfect, there is no need of Magistracy. *Perfectum est cui nihil deest.* Surely many Erastian Arguments do wound Civil as well as Ecclesiastical Government. 3. Church-censures are not acts of humane authority, for they are dispensed in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and (if *clave non errante*) are ratified in heaven. 4. Discipline is no addition to that Word which is able to make the man of God perfect, for it is one of the directions of the Word. 5. The comparison which some make between the efficacy of the Word preached, and the efficacy of Church-discipline, as to the point of converting and winning soules, is a meer fallacy *ab ignoratione elenchi*: for Church discipline is not intended as a converting, light-giving, or life-giving Ordinance. *Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*: and the Word is *the power of God for salvation to every one that beleeveth.* But Ecclesiastical Discipline hath a necessary use, though it hath not that use. Discipline and censures in the Church are intended. 1. For the glory of God, that his name may not be blasphemed, nor the doctrine of the Gospel reproached, by occasion of uncensured scandalls in the Church. 2. For keeping the Ordinances of Christ from prophanation and pollution, that *signa gratiæ divinæ*, the signes of Gods favour and grace, and the seales of his Covenant may be denied to unworthy scandalous persons. 3. For preserving the Church from the infection of bad and scandalous examples, it is fit to put a black mark upon them, and to put away the wicked person as the Apostle saith; for a rotten member if it be not cut off, and a scabbed sheep if not separated from the flock, may infect the rest. 4. For the good also of the offender himself, *that he may be ashamed*, and humbled. 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. 2 *Cor.* 2. 7. This afflicting of the sinner with shame and sorrow, may and shall by the blessing of God be a means to the destruction

ction of the flesh; 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. that is to tame and mortifie his lusts, and so far *removere prohibens* that he may be the better wrought upon by the Word. I conclude, Church-Government being instituted by Christ, and having a necessary use in the Church; the Erastians gain nothing by comparing it with the Word. Because it is not so necessary as the Word, *Ergo*, it is not necessary at all. Or because it is not efficacious in the same manner as the word is. *Ergo* it is not efficacious at all. The Apostle saith *Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the Gospel*, 1 *Cor.* 1.17. What if he had said *Christ sent me not to rule but to preach the Gospel?* Then had the Erastians triumphed. Yet this expression could not have proved that Church-government is not an Ordinance of Christ, more then that can prove that Baptisme is not an Ordinance of Christ. A negative in the comparative, will not inferre a negative in the positive.

3. *Object. I could never yet see* said Mr. *Coleman, how two co-ordinate governments exempt from Superiority and inferiority can be in one State.*

Against this I instanced in the co-ordinate governments of a General and an Admiral, of a Master and a Father, of a Captain and a Master in one ship. Mr. *Hussey* finding he can not make good Mr. *Colemans* word, tells me pag. 7. that he meaneth two supreme co-ordinate Governments. Where first he loseth ground, and tacitely yeeldeth that Church-Government and Civil Government, distinct each from other do well consist, as long as they are not supreme, but as two armes under one head: No inconsistency therefore of Congregational and Classical Elderships, and of Provinciall Assemblies, with the subordinate Magistrates and civil Courts in Cities and Counties. Next we shall find also in Scripture two co-ordinate supreme Governments, for the civil and the Ecclesiastical Sanhedrin of the Jewes were both supreme and co-ordinate, and there was no appeal from the sentence of either: as is evident by that disjunctive Law, *Deut.* 17.12. *And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest* (that is to the Priests, as *vers.* 9.) *or unto the Judge* (that is, the Assembly or Court of Judges, as I have cleared else-where) *even that man shall die.* But I have also answered more fully this objection concerning co-ordination. Chap. 8. 4. *Object.*

4. *Object.* Ministers have other work to do, and such as will take up the whole man. *To this Argument* (saith Mr. *Hussey pag.* 8.) *Mr. Gilespie maketh no answer at all, though Saint Paul useth the very self same Argument to discharge the Preachers from oversight of the poor. Act.* 6. 2. *God forbid we should leave the care of the word of God, and serue at Tables.* It will not be unseasonable to mind both him and Mr. *Prynne* that the canonized names by them used *Stylo Romano*, Saint *Paul*, Saint *Matthew*, Saint *Mark*, &c. ought to be laid aside, except they will use it of all Saints, and why not as well Saint *Moses*, and Saint *Aaron* (whom the Psalmist calls *the Saint of the Lord*?) or why not Saint *Aquila*, Saint *Apollos*, Saint *Epaphras*, &c. Methinks men professing Reformation ought not to satisfie themselves in using this forme of speech, onely of such as have been canonized at *Rome*, and inrolled Saints in the Popes Calender. And as strange it is that Mr. *Hussey* makes *Paul* to act in the business, *Act.* 6. before he was either Saint or Apostle. Now to the Argument. I did answer at first (though Mr. *Hussey* is pleased not to take notice of it) *pag.* 36. that where Mr. *Coleman* objected, Ministers have other work to do, he might as well have added, that when Miuisters have done that other work, and all that ever they can, yet without the power of Church-government, they shall not keep themselves, nor the Ordinances from pollution: that is, Church-Government is a part of their work, and a necessary part, which hath been proved: I thought it enough to touch an answer where an objection was but touched: another objection in that very place being more insisted on (and with more colour of reason) concerning the fear of an ambitious ensnarement.

And for the objection now in hand, Mr. *Hussey* hath made it no whit stronger by his instance from *Act.* 6. For 1. the Apostles did not wholy lay aside the care of the poor. Sure *Paul* (afterward an Apostle) took great care of the poor at diverse times, and in diverse places as himself recordeth: but such taking care of the poor as did distract and hinder them from the main work of preaching the Gospel, this was it which they declined; and in that respect the work of baptizing also did give place to the work of preaching, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Likewise

the

the work of Discipline must be so ordered, as may not hinder the principal work of preaching the Gospel: which is very possible, yea *probatum est*: for where Church-government is exercised, there are as painful Preachers as any in the World, and such as neglect none of their other work. 2. To take speciall and particular care of the poor, did belong by Christs institution (whose mind was no doubt known to the Apostles) to the office of Deacons, and for that reason the Ministers of the word ought in like manner to be relieved of that burthen by Deacons: but Church-Government doth belong to the Elders of the Church, of whom some labour both in Doctrine and Government, others in Government onely.

But neither must the Argument go so, I have another thing to ask; what is that other work which will take up the whole man? Mr. *Hussey pag.* 12. expounds Mr. *Colemans* meaning, *that the preaching of the Gospel would take up the whole man, especially in our time: our knowledge of the Scriptures is to be acquired by ordinary means &c.* And in his Epistle to the Parliament he saith, *I found the Minister charged onely with preaching and baptizing, which being performed with such zeal and diligence as is needful, is aboundantly a sufficient employment.* And so he takes off the Minister not onely from Government, but from visiting particular families, especially the sick; from catechising and examining those who are to be admitted to the Lords Supper, from the celebration of the Lords Supper it self, to say nothing of the solemnization of marriage, yea from disputations in Schools concerning the controversies of the time, which yet himself so much calls for. And why? the Minister hath other work to do, and such as will take up the whole man, which is to preach and baptize.

5. *Object.* If acts of Government be put in the hands of Church-Officers, there is fear of an ambitious ensnarement, which Mr. *Coleman* proved by an arguing from his owne heart to the hearts of other men. *Mr. Gilespies answer to the matter of ambition* saith Mr. *Hussey, pag.* 10. *is onely by involving the Civil Magistrate in the same danger of ambition.* And here he falleth out into a concertation, professedly with my answer, but really with Mr. *Colemans* Argument: for the foundation of his

Argument

Argument was universal. *Might I measure others by my selfe, and I know not why I may not (God fashioneth mens hearts alike, and as in water face answers to face, so the heart of man to man) &c.* Hereupon I replyed, *Is this corruption onely in the hearts of Ministers ? or is it in the hearts of all other men ? I suppose he will say in all mens hearts ; and then his Argument will conclude against all Civil Government.*

And now *per omnes musas* I beseech him, which of us involveth the Magistrate in ambition ? Must I be charged with involving the Magistrate because I discovered that Mr. *Colemans* Argument involveth the Magistrate ? He might as truly say he is not the Traytor that commits Treason, but he is the Traytor that reveals Treason. And why saith he that my answer was *onely* concerning that involving of the Magistrate ? Did I not first shew that the two Scriptures on which Mr. *Colemans* Argument was grounded, did not prove it : though now Mr. *Hussey* tells us Mr. *Coleman* did but allude to those Scriptures (I am sure it was all the Scripturall proof which was brought for that Argument upon which so much weight was laid) *which I will not trouble my Reader withall* saith he : A pretty shift, when a man cannot defend the Argument, then forsooth he will not trouble the Reader. Next, did I not deny that which Mr. *Coleman* did take for granted ; that we may reason from this or that particular corruption in one mans heart, to prove the same particular corruption in all other mens hearts, and that *Paul* taught us not so ? *Phil.* 2. 3. Did I not also answer in his owne words, that his Brethrens *wisedom and humility may safely be trusted with as large a share of Government as themselves desire ?* Did I not lastly answer, that if his whole Argument were granted, it cannot prove that there ought to be no Church-Government, for where the thing is necessary, abuses must be corrected and amended, but must not take away the thing it self ? Unto which exceptions nothing hath been replied, nor offered to vindicate or make good that Argument which was publikely offered to the Parliament. If such men were fit to put the reverend Assembly and all the Ministery of *England* to school again, to learn to dispute, let every pious and wise man judg. And so I am ledd on to another Objection.

6. Object.

6. *Object.* Schools of Divinity will advance learning and Religion, and get us an able Miniſtery more then Eccleſiaſticall Government can do. So Mr. *Coleman* in his Sermon pag. 26. Yea Mr. *Huſſey* calleth for Schools, that there may be unity found among the Preachers of the Goſpel, together with more learning and knowledge, *pag.* 12, 13, 14, 15. (where by the way the Jeſuits are much beholding to him, and Proteſtant Writers very little.) In his Epiſtle to the Parliament he deſireth that Miniſters would unbend their thought of Government, *and think on wayes to get knowledge.* I ſhould have thought *multum ſcientiæ, parum Conſcientiæ,* might be as ſeaſonable a complaint. Knowledge and learning are indeed moſt neceſſary, and I am confident ſhall flouriſh more under Presbyteriall Government, then either under Popery or Prelacy. School-diſputes need not hinder Eccleſiaſtical Government: that ought to be done, and this not to be left undone. There is a practical part which belongs to Presbyteries and Synods, as well as a contemplative part belonging to Schools: which made (m) the Divines of *Zeeland* to offer this among other Articles to be adviſed upon by the Synod of *Dort*, that they who are preparing for the Miniſtery, may (after their education at Schools, before their ſetling in the Miniſtery) be for ſome ſpace preſent in Presbyteries, to learn Church-Government. That which a Miniſter muſt do, is work: and that work is labouring in the Word and Doctrine, in ruling and watching over the flock, in diſpenſing the Ordinances to them as a faithful Steward. But Mr. *Huſſey* pag. 15. tells us the Miniſter muſt not be called from his ſtudy to examine notorious offences: which indeed ſuteth his notion of Schools. The Grecians did not intend Schools for any ſuch work; for to them σχολὴ was reſt from work, and σχολάζειν to be idle, to take a vacation from work, that is, from other affairs, and from a practical life, to attend reading and ſtudies. If Schools be made to ſerve for all thoſe neceſſary uſes which Church-Government will ſerve for; then there is much ſaid: but otherwiſe nothing againſt us.

(m) Synod. Dord. ſeſſ. 18. *Et quia vocati ad miniſterium regimini Eccleſiæ aliquando ſunt præficiendi: Eccleſiarum vero regimen in Scholis exacte non addiſcitur, non abs re foret ſi aliquot ante vocationem menſibus, in urbibus celebrioribus peteſtas Illis fiat ut interſint Presbyteriis, &c.*

7. *Object.* But *Quis cuſtodiet ipſos cuſtodes?* if the power of Government and cenſures be in the hands of Church-officers, how ſhall they be cenſurable and puniſhable for their owne of-

fences? How shall the Censurers themselves be censured? This objection I find in the eight Epistle of *Dionysius Areopagita* (or who ever he was that wrote under that name) It was made by one *Demophilus, What then say you, must not the prophane Priests, or such as are convicted to have done somewhat amisse be corrected? and shall it be lawful to them alone, while they glory in the Law, to dishonour God by breaking of the Law?* A little after, this direct answer is made to the objection. *But if perhaps any among these erre from that which it becommeth him to do, παρὰ τῶν ὁμοταγῶν ἁγίων ἐπανορθωθήτω, let him be corrected by the Saints of his owne order, and so order shall not be intermixed with order, but each one shall be exercised in his owne order and administration.* As the faults of Church-officers deserve the greatest censures, so in all the Reformed Churches, where the free exercise and administration of Church-discipline is received, there is greatest severity of Church-discipline against Church-officers, and especially against Ministers of the Word, when any such are upon just proof convict of scandal. It is too much diffidence (and groundlesse, I dare say) to apprehend that Ministers who have taken upon them the bond of such a Covenant, and joyned in such a Reformation, will yet be ready to connive at any scandalous person of their owne coat. And if a Classis should happen to commit such an error, yet there can be no such fear in this particular from a Provinciall or National Assembly, which in a well Reformed Church, (as they are constituted of choice, able, and godly, both Ministers and others assembled from diverse quarters, so) use to correct (not to confirme) the maladministration in inferior Ecclesiastical Courts. I speak here of the Ecclesiastical offences of Church-officers: their other offences belonging wholy to the Civil cognizance and Jurisdiction.

8. *Object.* But *let the Scripture speak expressely, and Institutions appear Institutions, and all must bow.* It is asked why we must not prove *a must be*, as well as *a may be*: and whether do our proofes amount to an Institution and a *Jus divinum*. For satisfaction in this point also. I answer the Question which for the present I speak to, is not whether Christ hath in his Word limited and determined us to any one particular forme of Church-government, so as no other forme can be admitted

as

as lawful or agreeable to the Word: Much leſſe do I now enquire what is that particular forme or kind of Government which Chriſt hath inſtituted. But the preſent controverſie with the Eraſtians is, whether Chriſt have not appointed and inſtituted a Government in his Church in the hands of Church-officers, diſtinct from Civil government: As it is one thing to enquire whether it be the will of God, that there be a civil Government or Magiſtracy, that is, that there be not an Anarchie in a Nation, but ſome rule and government. Another thing, to enquire whether God hath in his Word limitted a nation to any one particular kind of Civil Government, and if any, what it is? So it is one thing to enquire whether it be the will of Chriſt, that there be an Eccleſiaſtical Government, or an intrinſecal power of ruling in the hands of Church-officers, diſtinct from the civil Government? Another thing to ask whether the Word determineth any one kind of Church-Government as neceſſary, and which it is? The former, not the latter is our preſent controverſie. Yea in very truth the Eraſtians do oppoſe not onely the inſtitution, but the lawfulneſſe and agreeableneſſe to the Word of God, of a Church-Government diſtinct from the civil; For their principles and Arguments tend to the inveſting of the civil Magiſtrate with the whole and ſole power of Church-Government; as that which belongeth to him onely, and that *Jure divino*: So that if their Principles hold good, it ſhall be unlawful and contrary to the Word of God, for Church-officers to claim, or aſſume, or exerciſe any Government or power of cenſures. Though (I ſay) the clearing and vindicating of the lawfulneſſe of a diſtinct Church-Government, doth overthrow the Eraſtian Principles: yet that I may deal the more clearly and fully, for the ſatisfaction of all ſuch as may be ſatisfied, this I avouch and averre: *It is* Jure divino, *It is the Will of God, and of his Sonne Jeſus Chriſt the King and Head of his Church, that there be a Church-Government in the hands of Church-Officers diſtinct from the Civil Government. It is* de neceſſitate præcepti, *of the neceſſity of precept that it be ſo. It is ſin and a violation of Chriſts Inſtitution if it be not ſo.* I am confident the Arguments which I have brought Chap. 9. will reach this point, and fully con-

clude it, especially if the strength of them be put together. Yet now to drive the nail to the head, I adde these following Arguments, directly inferring and proving an Institution.

First, The Scripture speaks of Church Government in the same manner, and with the same height, fulnesse, and peremptorinesse of expression, as it speaketh of other things which are without controversie acknowledged even by the Erastians themselves to be Institutions of Christ. For instance, Let the Erastians prove against the Socinians the necessity and perpetuity of the Ordinance of Baptisme, that it ought to continue alwais in the Church, and that by vertue of an Institution and precept of Christ: I will undertake by the like *medium* to inferre the like conclusion concerning Church-Government. Again, let them prove the necessity, perpetuity, and institution (I say not now of the Word it self, or of preaching, but) of the ministery, or of the Pastoral office, I will bring the like Argument concerning Church-Government: I do not now compare or paralel the Government with the Ministery of the Word *quo ad necessitatem medii vel finis*, as being equally necessary to salvation, nor yet as being equally excellent; but this I say, The one is by the Scripture language an Institution and Ordinance of Christ as well as the other. One Ordinance may differ much from another, and still both be Ordinances.

Secondly, Church-Government is reckoned among such things as had an Institution, and which God did set in the Church, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. It is a good Argument for the Institution of Pastors and Teachers, that God set them in the Church, as we read in that place, and Christ gave them to the Church, *Ephes.* 4. 11. Will not this then hold as well for the Institution of a Government in the Church? That the Governments mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. are Ecclesiastical and distinct from civil, is already proved, Chap. 6.

Thirdly, If it be the will and commandement of God, that we be subject and obedient to Church-Governors, as those who are over us in the Lord, as well as to civil Governors, then it is the will of God that there be a rule and Government in the Church, distinct from the civil. For *Relata se mutuo ponunt vel tollunt.* If we be obliged by the fifth commandement to honour

honour Magistrates as Fathers, then it is the will of God that there be such Fathers. So when we are commanded to know them which are over us in the Lord, and to esteem them highly, 1 *Thess.* 5. 12. to honour doubly Elders that rule well, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. to be subject and obedient unto Ecclesiasticall Rulers, *Heb.* 13. 17. with verse 7. 24. doth not this intimate the will of God, that Pastors and Elders be over us in the Lord, and rule us Ecclesiastically?

Fourthly, That which being administred is a praise and commendation to a Church, and being omitted is a ground of controversie to Christ against a Church, can be no other then an Ordinance, and necessary duty. But Church-Government and Discipline is such a thing, as being administred, it is a praise and commendation to a Church, 2 *Cor.* 2. 9. *Revel.* 2. 2. and being omitted is a ground of Controversie to Christ against a Church, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. 2. 6. *Revel.* 2. 14. 20. *Ergo.*

Fifthly, The rules and directions concerning an Ecclesiastical Government and Discipline are delivered precept-wise in Scripture 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. *Put away that wicked person from among you.* 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. *Note that man.* *Tit.* 3. 10. *A man that is an Heretick after the first and second admonition reject.* *Augustine lib. contra Donatistas post Collationem, Cap.* 4. saith that Church-censures and discipline are exercised in the Church *secundum præceptum Apostolicum*, according to the Apostolick precept, for which he citeth 2 *Thess.* 3. 14.

Sixthly, There is an Institution and command, *Matth.* 18. 17. *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican.* In which place there are three Acts of the Church, that is, of the Assembly of Church-Officers. 1. They must be met together to receive complaints and accusations, *Tell the Church.* 2. They give sentence concerning the case, *if he neglect to hear the Church*, &c. Where heareing is required and obedience, there must needs be an authoritative speaking or judging. So that they who would prove the Church here hath onely power to admonish doctrinally, because it is said *If he hear not the Church*; they may as well prove that the Judges of Israel had no more power but to admonish doctrinally because it is

appointed *Deut.* 17. 12. that the man who will not hearken to the Judge ſhall die; and it is not there expreſſed that the Judge ſhall put him to death, more then it is expreſſed here that the Church ſhall declare the offender to be as a heathen and a publican. 3. They muſt bind ſuch a one by Excommunication, *Whatſoever ye bind on earth*, &c.

Neither could it ever enter in the thoughts of Jeſus Chriſt to command one Church-member or private brother to eſteem another brother as an heathen and a publican, whom he would not have ſo eſteemed by the whole Church: and leaſt of all can it be the will of Chriſt that one and the ſame perſon ſhould be eſteemed by one of the Church to be as a heathen and a publican, and withall be eſteemed by the whole Church as a brother, a good Chriſtian, a Church-member, and accordingly to be freely admitted to the Ordinances.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

The necessity of a distinct Church-Government under Christian as well as under Heathen Magistrates.

SOme when they could not denie but there was a Church-Government in the Primitive and Apostolick Churches, distinct from all civil Government, and Churchcensures distinct from all civil punishments; yet they have aledged (though no such thing was alledged of old, neither by *Constantine* and other Christian Emperors, nor by others in their behalf) that this was for want of Christian Magistrates, and that there is not the same reason for such a Church-Government or censures, where there is a Christian Magistracy. See Mr. *Hussey's plea*, *pag.* 24. As likewise Mr. *Prynne* in his *Diotrephes catechised.* Master *Colemans re-examination*, *pag.* 16. calls for an instance where the State was Christian. For taking off this exception, I shall observe,

First of all (n) *Grotius* (otherwise no good friend to Church-

(n) Annot. in Luc. 6. 22.

Reperti sunt & qui Judicia ista Ecclesiæ putarent inhibenda, quoties Christianas potestates Deus concederet sæculo &c. At Christi leges multo plus exigunt, quam in commune civibus imperii alicujus præscribi solet, aut etiam potest, semper enim magna pars hominum Φρονεῖ τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς. *Quare civiles quidem leges suo funguntur officio, si graviora & societati maxime nocentia delicta coerceant: at quæ contra dilectionis, contra mansuetudinis, contra patientiæ leges peccantur, extra communes leges sunt posita: non etiam extra eas leges quas se sectantibus Christus præscripsit, & secundum quas judicare debet ille selectus ex mundo cœtus.*

Government,

Government, being poisoned with the Arminian Principles, who have endeavoured to weaken extremely the authority of Classical and Synodical Assemblies, and to give a kind of Papal power to the Magistrate) yet in this particular he argueth strongly for us, and not against us.

Secondly, Where is that Christian Magistracy which hath suppressed or punished all such offences as did fall under Ecclesiastical cognizance and censure, in the Primitive and Apostolick Churches? Or where is that Christian Magistrate that will yet undertake to punish all those offences and scandals which were censured in the Apostolick Churches? Till some such instance be given, this exception against Church-discipline and censures under a Christian Magistrate hath not so much as colour enough. *Aliæ sunt leges Cæsarum, aliæ Christi: aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus noster præcipit* saith *Hierome in Epitaph. Fabiolæ. Cæsars Lawes, and Christs Lawes are not the same, but different. Papinianus commands one thing, Paul another thing. Chrysostome Homil. 12. in 1. Epist. ad Cor.* tells us that the best and wisest Law-givers had appointed no punishment for fornication, for consuming and trifling away of time with playing at dice, for gluttony and drunkennesse, for Stage-plaies and lascivious whorish gestures therein. Is there not some cause to apply all this (and much more of this kind) even to Christian Law-givers and Magistrates? Put the case that he who is called a brother (as the Apostle speaks) that is a member of the visible Church, be found grossely ignorant of the Principles of Religion, and so far from growing in knowledge, that he loseth the knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the truth of God which he had (for this hath been diverse times observed) through neglect of the means: or if he be known to neglect ordinarily prayer in and with his Family, and to continue in that offence after admonition: or if he live in known or scandalous malice and envie, and refuse to be reconciled with his neighbour, or if he be a known lyar and dissembler: or if by his words and actions he do scandalously and manifestly shew himself covetous, drowned in sensuality, ambitious, proud: or if he give a foul scandal by filthy and obscene speeches, by lascivious, obscene, whorish-like gestures or actions, where the act it self of adultery

tery or fornication cannot be proved. I suppose that for these and such like scandals (which are causes deserving not onely the Elderships enquiry and admonition, but suspension from the Lords Table) the Christian Magistrate neither doth, nor by the civil or municipal Laws is bound to arraign and punish all such as are guilty thereof.

Thirdly, whereas Arch-bishop *Whitgift Answ. to the Admon. pag.* 114. did alledge that the Church *may not be governed under a Christian Magistrate as it may under a Tyrant*, which he brings as an exception against ruling Elders and Elderships, while he could not denie but such there were in the Primitive Church. Mr. *Cartwright* in his Reply pag. 140. answereth, that if these Elders under a Tyrant had medled with any office of a Magistrate; then there had been some cause why a godly Magistrate being in the Church, that office should cease: but since they did onely assist the Pastor in matters Ecclesiastical, there is no distinction between times of persecution, and times of peace, as touching the office of Elders. The like say I of Church-censures and discipline. If the Government of the Church by Presbyteries and Synods, if suspension and excommunication in the Apostles times had been an usurping of any thing belonging to the Magistrate, then there had been some reason to lay aside all Church-censures and Ecclesiastical Government, when the Magistrate turned Christian, and willing to do his duty. But if not, then the civil and Church-government may still remain distinct, even where the State is Christian.

Fourthly, Every Institution or Ordinance of Christ, must continue as a perpetual obligation, unless we can find in the Word that Christ hath given us a dispensation or taken off the obligation, and set a period to the Ordinance, that it shall continue so long and no longer. I mean every Ordinance of Christ must be perpetual, which we cannot prove from the Word to be but temporal or extraordinary. Now in the Word Christ hath not appointed the governing the Church, and correcting scandals, to be onely under a Tyrant, and to cease under a Christian Magistrate: neither is there any such thing held forth in Scripture (which yet our opposites must shew, if they will make good what they say) But contrariwise, what Christ delivered

to the Apostles, and they to the Churches, is to be kept and continued, till our Lord come again 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. 26. 1 *Tim.* 6. 14. and he himself saith, *Rev.* 2. 24. 25. *That which ye have already, hold fast till I come.* These things were not spoken to the Apostles, to *Timothy*, to the Churches of that time personally (for they were not to live till Christs comming again) but the charge was given to them in name of and with respect unto all the Ministery and Churches of Christ.

Fifthly, This exception made against Church-censures under a Christian Magistrate, supposeth that such censures will make an interfering and clashing between the civil and Ecclesiastical power. But there is no cause for that fear, these powers being so hugely differenced in their efficient causes, matters, formes, ends, effects, objects, adjuncts, correlations, and ultimate terminations, as I have made it to appear in the particulars, Chap. 4.

Sixthly, The Churches liberty and power is not to be infringed, diminished, nor taken away; but preserved, maintained, enlarged, and augmented under a Christian Magistrate. Were it not a sad case, if there should be cause to say that the Churches of Christ have not so much liberty under a Christian Magistrate to keep themselves and the Ordinances from pollution, as they had under Pagan and Infidel Magistrates?

Seventhly, Why may not Christian Church-government consist with Christian Magistracy, as well as the Jewish Church government did consist with the Jewish Magistracy, being of the same Religion? Or if we please to look to later Presidents, who can be ignorant that civil government and Church-discipline have rather strengthened then destroyed each other, not onely in *France* where the Magistracy is not Protestant, but in *Scotland*, in the *Low-Countries*, in *Geneva*, and else-where?

Eightly, We have covenanted to endeavour a Reformation of Church-Government and discipline *according to the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed Churches.* Now both the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches, leadeth us to a Church-government distinct from civil Government: and the example of the best Reformed Churches doth undeniably lead us to a Church-discipline, even where the

the Magistrate is Christian, neither doth the word make any exception of Christian States, but contrariwise chargeth us to keep the commandement and Ordinances till Christ come again.

Ninthly, The Magistrate hath other work to do, and such as will take up the whole man: and if he should take upon him the whole burthen of Church-Government, the enquiring into, examining and correcting of all scandals in the Church, surely it is more then he can discharge, or give a good account to God of. It will be hard enough to Church-officers to do it, though they are set apart to that service, and *ex officio* do watch over peoples souls, as they that must give an account. But for the Christian Magistrate to discharge the whole corrective part of Church-Government, and to watch over the soules of all the people; so as to take care of the purging of the Church from scandals, and for that end to observe, examine, and judge all offences in the Church, and to determine that this man ought to be admitted to the Sacrament, and that man ought not to be admitted (for that there must be a suspension of scandalous and unworthy persons, I now take it for granted because of the Ordinance of Parliament) as it is impossible for the Magistrate to do all this, so I beleeve it will be to him *durus sermo, a hard saying*, to hear that he must give account to God of all these things; and that Ministers have no more to answer for but preaching, ministring the Sacraments to those to whom they are appointed to give them, catechizing, visiting the sick, exhorting, admonishing, reproving, comforting. It was a good argument against the Prelat; he assumed the Ecclesiastical government of a whole Diocesse, and could not give account to God for so many thousands, and sometime hundreths of thousand souls. Yet Mr. *Coleman* would have had the Parliament to be Church-Officers to the whole Kingdom in point of corrective Government, and the Ministery to have no part of that government. But then I ask, How shall they answer for that Ecclesiastical Government and administration of theirs, more then the Prelat could answer for the Ecclesiastical Government of a whole Diocesse? If it be said that the Parliament is onely to settle a rule, and to give order what is to be done, and to com-

mit the execution and the managing of particular cases to subordinate Courts and inferiour Officers, then no more is said then the Prelats did plead for themselves, that they did *per alium* what they could not do *per se*. So that such principles do tend directly to involve the Parliament in the Prelatical guiltinesse, which our Principles do avoid. Was it not another Argument used against the Prelats, that they could not manage both Civil and Church-government, and that an Ecclesiastical Administration could not consist with civil power and places in the Parliament or with offices of State, any one of these administrations (either the civil or the Ecclesiastical) requiring the whole man.

Do not the *Erastians* endeavour to draw the Parliament into the very same absurdity with which the Prelats were pressed? For if any of these two administrations require the whole man, how can the civil Magistrate (though Christian) take upon him the burthen of Church-Government, more then Church-Officers can take upon them the burthen of civil-government? *Philo* the Jew gives this reason why *Moses* did make a partition of the charge between *Joshua* and *Aaron*, committing to the one the civil, to the other the Ecclesiastical administration. *He considered that it was impossible rightly to take care both of the supreme civil power, and of the Priesthood, since the one professeth to care for things pertaining to God, the other for men. Philo de charitate.*

Tenthly, *Ratio immutabilis facit præceptum immutabile.* If the Apostle had required the *Corinthians* to excommunicate the incestuous man, upon such grounds and reasons as were proper to that time, and are not applicable to after times, so as to prove the necessity of excommunication for the like offence, then there were some reason why excommunication should not be esteemed a perpetual ordinance in the Church: but it is manifest that the reasons given by the Apostle were not proper to that time, but do concern this time as well as that. The reasons are taken 1. From the glory of God, *vers.* 1. 2. He that had done such wickedness as was not so much as named among the Gentiles, was not to be suffered among Gods people, but to be taken away from among them; If evil be not put away from Israel, it is a great dishonour to the God of Israel. This first argument used by the Apostle, is like that *Ezek.* 36. 22, 23. They had profha-

ned

ned the holy name of God among the Heathen, therefore God would sanctifie his great name, and make the Heathen to know that he is the Lord, when he should be sanctified in his people before their eyes. 2. From the commission, power, and authority which the Church of *Corinth* that is their Presbytery (compare 2 *Cor.* 2, 6.) had to excommunicate such a one. *vers.* 4, 5. *In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ when ye are gathered together.* &c. 3. From the good and benefit of the sinner himself, that he might be ashamed, humbled, reclaimed, mortified and saved: *vers.* 5. *For the destruction of the Flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.* 4. From the Churches good, that the Church might be preserved from the contagion of such sinful examples *vers.* 6. *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?* 5. From that which was signified and typified by the purging out of leaven from Israel in the time of the Passeover. *vers.* 7, *Purge out therefore the old leaven &c.* 6. From the end of Christs death, which was to purifie and sanctifie, as well as to reconcile and justifie his people, *vers.* 7. 8. *For Christ our Passeover is sacrificed for us, Therefore let us keep the Feast, &c.* 7. From the difference which ought to be made between the foul sins of Church-members, and others that are not Church-members: a blacker mark is to be put upon the former, then upon the latter: and more withdrawing there must be from a scandalous brother or professor of Christian Religion, then from a prophane Heathen, *vers.* 9. 10. 11.

From all which it doth appear, that it is not without good reason that *Martyr* and *Pareus* upon 1 *Cor.* 5. do maintain the necessity of Excommunication, under a Christian and pious Magistrate, as well as under an Infidel and prophane Magistrate.

Eleventhly, The end and use for which Church-censures are necessary, is not intended and endeavoured, much lesse attained, by the government of the Christian Magistrate. For though the Christian Magistrate punisheth many (I cannot say all) grosse and scandalous sins with corporal or civil punishments: yet to punish sin is one thing; to seek the salvation of the sinner is another thing: so the offender his suffering of punishment

nishment and satisfying the Law of the Land is one thing; his declaring of his repentance, and publike confession of his sin, for taking away the scandal which he hath given to the Church, is another thing. Suppose a delinquent (whose fault is not capitall by the law of the land, for instance a Fornicator, a drunkard, a common swearer, a Sabbath-breaker, or the like) to have suffered in his person or estate, all the punishment which he ought to suffer, so that he hath now made a civil atonement (as I may call it) for his offence, and the Christian Magistrate hath no further to charge him with. Suppose also that he is by such corporal or civil punishments as by a bit and bridle overawed and restrained from committing again the like external acts: Notwithstanding he hath not the least signe of true repentance and godly sorrow for his former foul and scandalous sins, and he is known to be not an accuser, but an excuser of himself for those faults and scandals. Such a one comes and desires to receive the Sacrament. Must his *pœnal satisfaction* to the Christian Magistrate be a sufficient *pœnitential satisfaction* to the Church? Here is a rock which the *Erastians* dash upon, unlesse they admit of a distinct Ecclesiastical Judgement, concerning the signes of repentance in a scandalous sinner, according to which, as these signes shall appear or not appear, he is to be admitted or not admitted to the Sacrament.

Twelfthly, the power of binding and loosing, is not a temporary but a perpetual power, that is, appointed by Christ to continue in his Church alwaies unto the end. Now this power is given onely to Church-officers, and Christ hath not given the keyes of discipline and the power of binding and loosing (of which else-where) to the Magistrate, nay not to the Christian Magistrate, more then to the Infidel Magistrate. Let the least hint be found in Scripture, where Christ hath given any such power to the Christian Magistrate, and I yeeld the cause.

Thirteenthly, The new Testament holdeth out as little of the Ministery of the Word and Sacraments under a Christian Magistrate, as it doth of a Church-government under a Christian Magistrate. Shall this therefore strengthen the Socinian Tenent, That Baptisme is not a perpetual Ordinance in the Church, and that we are not obliged by that commission

which

which the Apostles had to baptize? God forbid.

Fourteenthly, The German Anabaptists required an expresse warrant or example in the New Testament of a Christian Magistrate, or of the sword and wars in a Christian State, yet this hath been thought no good Argument against Magistracy and wars among Christians.

I cannot pretermit a passage of *Gualther*, who may seem to be opposite to me in this present Question. Even he in his Homily upon *John* 9. 22. after he hath spoken of Excommunication in the Jewish Church, and in the Apostolick Churches, he addeth (o) *And this day also there is need of Ecclesiastical discipline, which being instituted in the Reformed Churches, ought to be diligently kept, lest the indulgence of Magistrates, which reignes almost every where, should render the Doctrine of the Gospel suspected among those that are without, and that themselves also may be contained in their office, and may not think that any thing they will is lawful to them in the Church.*

(o) *Et hodie etiam disciplina Ecclesiastica opus est, quæ in reformatis Ecclesiis instituta diligenter servari debet, ne Magistratum indulgentia quæubique fere regnat, Evangelii doctrinam exteris suspectam reddat, & ut ipsi quoque in officio contineantur, nec sibi quidvis in Ecclesia licere putent.*

But after all this, let me put Mr. *Hussey* and other *Erastians* in mind, that if they do acknowledge that Jesus Christ hath instituted or commanded that there be a Church Government and power of censures distinct from the Civil Government, when the Magistrate is Heathenish or Idolatrous, let them speak it out, and let us agree so far. Otherwise if they do not agree in this, it is but a blind for them to make use of this distinction, that where the Magistrate is Christian, there is no necessity of a distinct Church-Government.

I conclude with a passage of Mr. *Prynne* in his *twelve considerable serious Questions touching Church-Government.* The ninth of those Questions runs thus. *Whether the Independents challenge of the Presbyterians to shew them any National Church, professing Christ in our Saviours or the Apostles daies, before any one Nation totally converted to the Christian Faith, or any general open profession made of it by the Princes, Magistrates, and major part of any Nation, Kingdom, Republick, who were then all generally Pagans and Persecutors of the Gospel, not then universally*

versally imbraced, be not a most irrational unjust demand? Sure if this hold against the Independents, it will hold as strongly, yea more strongly against the *Erastians*, to prove their demand to be most irrational and unjust, while they challenge us to shew them in the New-Testament a distinct Church-Government under a Christian Magistrate, or where the State was Christian, though themselves know Magistrates and States were then generally Pagan and not Christian: Yea there was in those daies much more of a national Church then of a Christian Magistrate.

A N

An Appendix to the second Book, containing a Collection of some Testimonies not cited before; And first a Testimony of King *James* in a Declaration of his, penned with his own hand, signed and delivered to the Commissioners of the Church of *Scotland* at *Linlithgow*, December 7. Anno 1585.

I *For my part shall never, neither my posterity ought ever cite, summon, or apprehend any Pastor or preacher for matters of Doctrine, in Religion, Salvation, Heresies, or true Interpretation of the Scripture: but according to my first act which confirmeth the liberty of preaching the Word, ministration of the Sacraments, I avouch the same to be a matter meer Ecclesiastical, and altogether impertinent to my calling. Therefore never shall I, nor ever ought they, I mean my posterity, acclaim any power or Jurisdiction in the foresaids.* His Majesties meaning was that he ought not to do this *in prima instantiâ*, that is, before the person be accused, convict, or judged in any Ecclesiastical Court. (which was the Question at that time, occasioned by Mr. *Andrew Melvill* his Case) Afterward in the same Declaration it followeth thus.

Christ saying Dic Ecclesiæ, *and one onely man stealing that dint in a quiet hole, the Act of Parliament reduceth the sentence for informality and nullity of processe, not as Judges whether the Excommunication was grounded on good and just causes or not, but as witnesses that it was unformally proceeded, against the warrant of Gods*

Word, example of all Reformed Kirks, and your owne particular custome in this Countrey. A little after. *I mind not to cut off any liberty granted by God to his Kirk. I acclaim not to my self to be judge of Doctrine in Religion, salvation, heresies, or true Interpretation of Scripture.* And after. *My Intention is not to meddle with Excommunication, neither acclaim I to my self or my Heires power in any thing that is meer Ecclesiastical and not ἀδιάφορον, nor with any thing that Gods Word hath simply devolved in the hands of his Kirk. And to conclude, I confesse and acknowledge Christ Iesus to be Head and Law-giver to the same. And whatsoever persons do attribute to themselves, as Head of the Kirk, and not as Member, to suspend or alter any thing that the Word of God hath onely remitted to them, that man I say committeth manifest Idolatry, and sinneth against the Father in not trusting the Words of his Son, against the Son in not obeying him and taking his place, against the holy Ghost, the said holy Spirit bearing the contrary record to his Conscience.*

Testimonies taken out of the Harmony of the Confessions of the Faith of the Reformed Churches, Reprinted at London 1643.

Pag. 238. Out of the confession of *Helvetia.*

FUrthermore, there is another power of duty, or ministerial power limited out by him, who hath full and absolute power and authority. And this is more like a Ministry then Dominion. For we see that some

ſome maſter doth give unto the ſteward of his houſe authority and power over his Houſe, and for that cauſe delivereth him his keyes, that he may admit or exclude ſuch as his maſter will have admitted or excluded. According to this power, doth the Miniſter by his office, that which the Lord hath commanded him to do, and the Lord doth ratifie and confirm that which he doth, and will have the deeds of his miniſters to be acknowledged and eſteemed as his own deeds, unto which end are thoſe ſpeeches in the Goſpel: *I will give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdom of heaven, and whatſoever thou bindeſt or looſeſt in earth, ſhall be bound and looſed in heaven.* Again, *whoſe ſins ſoever ye remit, they ſhall be remitted; and whoſe ſins ſoever ye retain, they ſhall be retained.* But if the miniſter deal not in all things as his Lord hath commanded him: but paſſe the limits and bounds of Faith, then the Lord doth make void that which he doth. Wherefore the Eccleſiaſtical power of the Miniſters of the Church, is that function whereby they do indeed govern the Church of God, but yet ſo as they do all things in the Church as he hath preſcribed in his Word; which thing being ſo done, the faithful do eſteem them as done of the Lord himſelf.

Matth. 16.

John 20.

Pag. 250. *Out of the confeſſion of* Bohemia.

THe 14th. Chapter of Eccleſiaſtical doctrine is of the Lords keyes, of which he ſaith to *Peter, I will give thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, and theſe keyes are the peculiar function or Miniſtery and adminiſtration of Chriſt his power, and his holy Spirit; which power is committed to the Church of Chriſt, and to the Miniſters thereof, unto the end of the world: that they ſhould not onely by preaching pub-

Matth. 16.

liſh the holy Goſpel, although they ſhould do this eſpecially, that is, ſhould ſhew forth that Word of true comfort, and the joyful meſſage of peace, and new tydings of that favour which God offereth, but alſo that to the beleeving and unbeleeving, they ſhould publikely or privately denounce and make known, to wit, to them his favour, to theſe his wrath, and that to all in general, or to every one in particular, that they may wiſely receive ſome into the houſe of God, to the communion of Saints, and drive ſome out from thence, and may ſo through the performance of their Miniſtery, hold in their hand the Scepter of Chriſt his Kingdom, and uſe the ſame to the government of Chriſt his Sheep.

And after, Moreover a manifeſt example of uſing the power of the keyes is laid out in that ſinner
1 Cor. 5. of *Corinth* and others, whom St. *Paul*, together with the Church in that place, by the power and authority of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and of his Spirit, threw out from thence and delivered to Sathan: and contrariwiſe after that God had given him grace to repent, he abſolved him from his ſins, he took him a-
2 Cor. 2. gain into the Church to the communion of Saints and Sacraments, and ſo opened to him the Kingdom of Heaven again. By this we may underſtand, that theſe keyes, or this divine function of the Lords, is committed and granted to thoſe that have charge of ſouls, and to each ſeveral Eccleſiaſtical Societies, whether they be ſmal or great. Of which thing the Lord ſayeth to the Churches, *Verily I ſay unto you,*
Matth. 18. *whatſoever ye bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven.* And ſtraight after: *For where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the middeſt of them.*

Pag. 253. *Out of the* French *Confeſſion.*

WE beleeve that this true Church ought to be governed by that regiment or diſcipline which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath eſtabliſhed, to wit ſo, that there be Paſtors, Elders, and Deacons, that the purity of doctrine may be retained, vices repreſſed. &c.

Pag. 257. *Out of the Confeſſion of* Belgia.

WE beleeve that this Church ought to be ruled and governed by that ſpiritual Regiment which God himſelf hath delivered in his word, ſo that there be placed in it Paſtors and Miniſters purely to preach, and rightly to adminiſter the holy Sacraments: that there be alſo in it Seniors and Deacons, of whom the Senate of the Church might conſiſt, that by theſe means true Religion might be preſerved, and ſincere doctrine in every place retained and ſpread abroad: that vicious and wicked men might after a ſpiritual manner be rebuked, amended, and as it were by the bridle of diſcipline kept within their compaſſe.

Pag. 260. *Out of the Confeſſion of* Auſpurge.

AGain, by the Goſpel, or as they term it by Gods Law, Biſhops, as they be Biſhops, that is, ſuch as have the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments committed to them, have no juriſdiction at all, but onely to forgive ſin, Alſo to know what is true doctrine; and to reject ſuch Doctrine as will not ſtand with the Goſpel, and to debarre from the communion of the Church ſuch as are notoriouſly wicked; not by humane force and violence, but by the word of God. And herein of neceſ-

sity the Churches ought by the law of God to perform obedience unto them, according to the saying of Christ, *He that heareth you, heareth me.* Upon which place the Observation saith thus. *To debar the wicked, &c. To wit by the judgement and verdict of the Presbyterie, lawfully gathered together. &c.*

A Testimony out of the Ecclesiastical Discipline of the Reformed Churches in France. *Cap.* 5. *Art.* 9.

THe knowledge of scandals, and the censure or judgement thereof belongeth to the Company of Pastors and Elders.

Art. 15. If it befalleth, that besides the admonitions usually made by the Consistories to such as have done amisse, there be some other punishment or more rigorous censure to be used: It shall then be done either by suspension, or privation of the holy communion for a time, or by excommunication or cutting off from the Church. In which cases the Consistories are to be advised to use all prudence, and to make distinction betwixt the one and the other: As likewise to ponder and carefully to examine the faults and scandals that are brought before them, with all their circumstances, to judge warily of the censure, which may be required.

Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum. *Cap.* 14. *Art.* 7. 8. 9.

PEccata sua natura publica, aut per admonitionis privatæ contemtum publicata, ex Consistorii totius arbitrio, modo & formâ ad ædificationem maximè accomodatis sunt Corrigenda.

Qui

Qui pertinaciter Consistorii admonitiones rejecerit, à S. Cœnæ communione suspendetur.

Si suspensus post iteratas admonitiones nullum pœnitentiæ signum dederit, ad Excommunicationem procedet Ecclesia.

Melchior Adamus de vitis Germanorum Theologorum, *Pag.* 342.

Cumq; sub id tempus (Anno 1545.) Fredericus *Elector* Palatinus, *qui* Ludovico *successerat, de Ecclesiarum agitaret Reformatione : composuit* Melanchthon, *cum evocato venire integrum non esset, scriptum de reformandis Ecclesiis : cujus Synopsin aliquot regulis comprehendit : quas addimus.* Conf. Theol. pag. 586.

Vera & salutaris gubernatio Ecclesiæ Christi præcipuè in his sex Membris consistit.

Primum, In vera & pura Doctrina, quam Deus Ecclesiæ suæ patefecit, tradidit, & doceri mandavit.

Secundo, In legitimo usu Sacramentorum.

Gubernatio Ecclesiæ in quibus consistat.

Tertio, In conservatione Ministerii Evangelici & obedientiæ erga Pastores Ecclesiarum, sicut Deus vult & postulat conservari Ministerium Evangelii, & servat ipse suâ potentiâ & presentiâ.

Quarto, In conservatione honestæ & piæ Disciplinæ retinendæ per judicia Ecclesiastica, seu jurisdictionem Ecclesiasticam.

Quinto, In conservandis studiis necessariæ doctrinæ & Scholis.

Sexto, Ad hæc opus est defensione corporali & facultatibus, ad personas, quæ sunt in officiis necessariis, alendas.

The

The Irish Articles of Religion. Art. 58.

NEither do we give unto him (the Supreme Magistrate) hereby the administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the keyes.

And *Art.* 69. But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those who make profession of the Faith of Christ, and live under the outward means of Salvation) be many in number: wherein the more or lesse sincerely according to Christs Institution, the Word of God is taught, the Sacraments are administred, and the authority of the keyes is used; the more or lesse pure are such Churches to be accounted.

Laurentius Humfredus de Religionis conservatione & Reformatione vera. Ad Nobilitatem, Clerum, & Populum *Anglicanum.*

He wrote from Basil.

PAg. 23. *Nec satis mirari possum nec satis dolere, cum intelligam in* his locis repudiari disciplinam Ecclesiasticam, & vel nullam esse vel nimis laxam, vel non satis vigilanter administratam, in quibus tamen alioqui Religionis sincera effigies cernitur: quasi Evangelium esse possit ubi non vivitur Evangelicè: aut quasi Christus lato, carnali, voluptuario delectetur Evangelio. &c. At in Ecclesia manere debet censura & jurisdictio, non minus quam gladius in Repub.* Pag. 25. *Sit ergo hæc prima Reformationis perfectæ ratio, nostri ac peccatorum recognitio & emendatio. Deinde severior adsit in Ecclesia castigatio & animadversio: ut illa laxitas & remissio frœnetur, quo minus & levius deinceps peccetur.*

FINIS.

THE THIRD BOOKE.

OF Excommunication from the CHURCH. AND, Of Suſpenſion from the LORDS TABLE.

CHAP. I.

An opening of the true ſtate of the queſtion, and of Maſter Prynnes *many miſtakes and miſ-repreſentations of our Principles.*

HAving now by the light of Scripture and other helps aſſerted a Church-government diſtinct from civill Magiſtracy, both in the Old and New Teſtament, the laſt part of my preſent undertaking ſhall be to vindicate the particular Ordinances of *Excommunication* and *Suſpenſion*, called by the Schoolmen *Excommunicatio major & minor*. Of which alſo I have before ſpoken divers things occaſionally

nally; for I have asserted an Excommunication and Suspension in the Jewish Church, *Booke* 1. *Chap.* 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. " The nature, grounds, reasons, uses, and ends whereof, were " not proper to the Old Testament, but such as concerne the " Christian Church. I have also brought arguments *Booke* 2. *Chap.* 9, 10. which conclude not onely Church-government, but Excommunication. And so much of my worke is done: Nevertheless there is more to doe. Mr *Prynne* first in his foure grand *Quæres*, and thereafter in his *Vindication* of the same, hath argued much, both against the Suspension from the Sacrament of a person not Excommunicated and wholly cast out of the Church, and against some of the most pregnant Scripturall proofes for Excommunication it selfe. In his *Vindication* he hath branched forth the controversie into ten points of difference. Two of these, *viz.* the fifth concerning suspension from the Sacrament of the Passeover, and the ninth concerning casting out of the Synagogue, I have discussed before in the first Book. Where I have also examined other assertions of his concerning the Jewish Sanhedrin, Temple, confession of sinne. The other points of difference not handled before, I am (as the Lord will help me) now to speak to.

The first point of difference is, whether in those foure Quæres of his he stated the Controversie aright. He is offended that I (in a Sermon of mine before the honourable House of Commons) charged the Questionist with mistakes, and that I did not take notice of the question concerning suspension from the Sacrament, as he stated it. *Vindic. pag.* 3. I had reason, because he had mis-stated it; and since it pleased him to interpose in a matter depending between the Honourable houses of Parliament, and the Reverend Assembly of Divines, and to publish a paper plainly reflecting upon a Petition of the Assembly, I hope he can not think either the Assembly, or me, tied to his stating of the question. If he will meddle with the businesse of the Assembly, he must speak to it as it is. And that it may now appeare how just cause I had to charge his Queres with mistakes of the state of the question, (which he still misstaketh) I shall endeavour a more particular and full discovery of these his mistakes. And first, that which was desired by the Assembly

was

was, that such a rule may be established by authority of Parliament, as may keep off all scandalous and notorious sinners from the Sacrament. The question was not what Texts of Scripture doe warrant this thing. It did not concerne me to debate whether the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament quoted by him, prove suspension from the Lords Table. The controversie was of the practicall conclusion, and of establishing such a rule, as may keep off scandalous persons from the Sacrament. If the thing be done, if the conclusion be consented to, there is the greater liberty for men to abound in their own sence concerning the *mediums* to prove it.

Secondly, and if he would needs debate what Texts of Scripture doe prove the thing, and what precept or president in Scripture doth warrant it: me thinks he had done better to have informed himselfe, on what Scripturall proofs the Reverend Assembly had grounded the suspension of scandalous sinners from the Sacrament, though not yet cast out of the Church; The proofes from Scripture voted in the Assembly, were these. Because the Ordinance it selfe must not be prophaned. And because we are charged to withdraw from those who walk disorderly. And because of the great sinne and danger both to him that comes unworthily, and also to the whole Church. The Scriptures from which the Assembly did prove all this, were, *Matth.*7.6. 2 *Thess.*3.6,14,15. 1 *Cor.*11.27, to the end of the Chapter, compared with *Jude* vers. 23. 1 *Tim.*5.22. Another proofe added by the Assembly was this. There was power and authority under the Old Testament to keep unclean persons from holy things, *Levit.*13.5. *Num.*9.7. 2 *Chro.*23.19. And the like power and authority by way of analogy continues under the new Testament, for the authoritative suspension from the Lords Table, of a person not yet cast out of the Church. Now that which was the strength of the Assemblies proofes of the proposition, Mr *Prynne* hath almost never touched, but run out upon other particulars.

Thirdly, observe that he disputes all along whether any Minister can suspend one from the Sacrament. But this no body, that I know, asserts. The power is given not *uni*, but *unitati*, to the Eldership, not to any one, either Minister or Elder.

Fourthly, that which in the Preface of his Queres he undertakes to prove, is, that Excommunication and suspension from the Sacrament, being a matter of great moment and much difficulty, is to be handled and established with great wisdom, caution and moderation. And his result in the close is concerning a limited jurisdiction in Presbyteries. As these things are not denied by any that I know, so himselfe manifestly acknowledgeth by these expressions, the thing it selfe for the substance, (which yet the current of his debate runneth against) and onely questioneth concerning the bounds, cautions and limitations. God forbid that Church-officers should ever claim an unlimited power: their power is given them to edification, and not to destruction, and we can doe nothing against the truth, but for the truth, 2 *Cor.* 13.8. 10. The power of censures must not be in the power of any one man, nor in the power of any who are themselves scandalous and worthy of censure. [a] There must be no sentence of Excommunication or suspension, upon reports, surmises, suspitions, but either upon the confession of the offence or proofe thereof by two witnesses at least. None must be excommunicated nor suspended for money matters, debts, and such like civill causes which are not of Ecclesiasticall cognizance, but are to be Judged by the civill Judge. It must not be for those *peccata quotidianæ incursionis*, such sinfull infirmities as all the godly in this life are guilty of: though on the other side, the scandalous sinnes meant of in this controversie, must not be restricted to such sinnes onely as can not stand with the state of grace. These and such like limitations we doe not onely admit of, but desire to be put.

a *Aug. Tom* 10. *hom.* 50. Nos vero à communione prohibere quenquam non possumus, quamvis hæc prohibitio nondum sit mortalis, sed medicinalis, nisi aut sponte confessum, aut in aliquò sive seculari sive Ecclesiastico judicio nominatum atque convictum.

Fifthly, he goeth about to cleare the state of the question out of *Aretius*, and citeth him for what himself now undertaketh to prove. Whereas *Aretius* holds Excommunication to be an ordinance of God both in the Old and New Testament, and that it was wanting through the injury and corruption of the times, the abuse of it in Popery having made the thing it self hatefull; and the most part in those places where he lived, loving carnall liberty so well, and taking upon them the protection and defence of prophane ones, and being so unwilling to

to be brought under the yoke of Christ. For these and the like reasons, he thought it not expedient to have that discipline of Excommunication erected at that time in those parts; as himselfe gives the reasons: and [b] he professeth withall, that he doth not despaire of better times, when men shall be more willing to submit to that discipline. So that this is the question, if it shall be stated out of *Aretius*; Whether Excommunication, being an Ordinance of God, ought to be setled where prophanesse and licentiousnesse abounds, and where the better party is like to be oppressed by the greater party: or whether we should wait till God send better times for the setling of it.

[b] *Theol. probl. loc.* 132. Interea non desperandum esse libenter fateor, dabit posterior ætas tractabiliores fortè animas, mitiora pectora, quàm nostra habent sæcula.

Sixthly, the Author of those questions maketh a parallel between that power of censures now desired to be setled in Presbyteries, and the Prelaticall tyranny, as if this were the very power which heretofore was declaimed against in, denied to, and quite taken away from the Prelates. Yea in the close he makes this power now desired to be setled in Presbyteries, to be such *as our very Lordly Prelates never durst to claime.* Yet *Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ politeia in tabulas digesta authore Richardo Cousin Tab* 5. tels me that the Episcopall Jurisdiction did exercise it selfe in these censures, which were common both to Lay-men and Clergy-men (as they were called.) 1. *Interdictio divinorum.* 2. *Monitio.* 3. *Suspensio vel ab ingressu Ecclesiæ, vel a perceptione Sacramentorum.* 4. *Excommunicatio.* 5. *Anathematismus, &c.* Nevertheless there is a truth too in that which Mr *Prynne* saith. I confesse the Prelates never durst desire that which this learned and pious Assembly hath desired in this particular. He hath said it. The Prelats never durst indeed take upon them to suspend all scandalous persons from the Sacrament; for if they had, it had been said unto most of them, *Physitian cure thy selfe*, besides the losing of many of their party. And moreover the very Lordly Prelates never durst make themselves to be but members of Presbyteries, nor to be subject to the admonitions and censures of their brethren, which every Minister now must doe. The Lordly Prelate did (contrary to the institution of Jesus Christ) make himselfe Pastor of many Congregations, even of his whole Dioceese, and did assume sole and whole power of Govern-

Government and Church censures to himself, and his underling officers which were to execute the same in his name. And as the appropriating of Jurisdiction to the Lordly Prelate, so the manner and kind of his Government, and his proceedings in Ecclesiasticall censures, came neither from Christ nor from the purest antiquity, but from the Popes Canon Law. What then hath Presbytery to doe with Prelacy? as much as light with darkness, or righteousness with unrighteousness. He that would see more of the differences between Presbyteriall and prelaticall Government, let him read a Book Printed in the Prelates times, entituled *The Pastor and the Prelate*. And *the cleere Antithesis between Presbytery and Prelacy* Printed at *London anno* 1644. See also what I have said before Book. 2. *Chap.* 3.

7. It is evident by his fourth Question, that he states the case, as if Ministers meant to know the secrets of all mens hearts, and to be so censorious and peremptory in their Judging as to quench the smoaking Flax or to break the bruised Reed; Thereupon he askes whether the Sacrament may be denyed to a man, *if he desires to receive it, in case he professe his sincere Repentance for his sinnes past, and promise newnesse of life for the time to come.* God forbid we be censorious, peremptory, and rigid in our judging of mens spirituall Estate; where there is any thing of Christ, its to be cherished, not quenched. But again, God forbid that we shut our eyes to call darkness light, or black white. In that very place where our Saviour condemneth uncharitable Judgement, immediately he addeth, *Give not that which is holy unto the Doggs, neither cast ye pearles before swine* Mat 7 6. Impenitency under a scandalous sinne is discerneable either by not confessing it, or by not forsaking it. All our present controversie is concering a visible Church, visible Saints, visible holinesse, visible Repentance, visible fitnesse or qualification for the Sacrament, that is [c] of such externall signes and evidences as the word of God holds out for judging of the spirituall Estate of other men, not of such internall gracious marks whereby

(c) *Concil. Nicæn. can.* 11. Ab omnibus verò illud præcipue observetur, ut animus eorum & fructus pœnitentiæ attendatur. Quicunque enim cum omni timore & lachrymis perseverantibus, & operibus bonis conversationem suam, non verbis solis, sed opere & veritate demonstrant, cum tempus statutum etiam ab his fuerit implerum, & orationibus jam cæperint communicare, licebit etiam Episcopo humanius circa eos aliquid cogitare. Qui vero indifferenter habuerint lapsum, & sufficere sibi quod Ecclesiam introierint, arbitrantur, ipsi omnimodo tempora statuta complebunt.

whereby a man must judge of his own spirituall Estate. And so he that professeth his sincere Repentance for his sinnes past, and promiseth newnesse of life for the time to come, if there be nothing which (visibly and to the eye of man) giveth the lye to his profession and promise, (for instance, if it can be proved that immediately before or immediately after he hath professed or promised the contrary to his companions in his wickednesse, or that he still continueth in the practise of that sinne) is not to be excluded as an impenitent sinner from the Sacrament.

3. The third *Quære*, as also the conclusion of all, runneth upon a great mistake, by reason of the confounding of things which are of a different nature. There is great weigh-laid upon this, that there is as much sin & danger to a mans soule in his unworthy and unprofitable hearing of the word, as in his unworthy receiving of the Sacrament; and therefore Ministers may as well refuse to Preach unto people, whom they deeme unprofitable hearers, as refuse to give them the Sacrament, because they judge them unmeet to receive it. Whether the sinne of unworthy hearing be as great as the sinne of unworthy receiving the Sacrament, I will not now debate. The[d] Reply which was made to his *Quæries* by another, hath said enough to that point. But that which I intend in this place, is (for clearing a maine Principle which we goe upon) to distinguish these two things. There are some Ordinances appointed for the *Conversion of Sinners*. There are other Ordinances appointed for the *Communion of Saints*. The Preaching of the word and the hearing thereof, though it hath no small influence into the Communion of Saints, yet it is also appointed for converting and bringing in Sinners who have no part in the Communion of Saints. The Sacrament was not appointed for the Conversion of Sinners, but is peculiar to the Communion of Saints. The Apostles Preached to the unbeleiving Jewes in the Temple and Synagogues *Act.* 2. 46. *Act.* 3. 11. 12. *Act.* 5. 12. 42. *Act.* 9. 20. 22. 23. But it is onely said of those that gladly received the word, *they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers.* Act. 2. 42. The Apostles Preached also to many Heathens and Idolaters, but they

(d) *A full answer to a Printed Paper entituled* foure serious Questions concerning Excommunication and Suspension &c.

they admitted none to the Sacramens till they saw such evidences as might perswade them in the judgement of charity that they were such as might be admitted. They that are suspended from the Sacrament, yea they that are excommunicate, are admitted to the hearing of the word for their conversion, as the unbeleeving Jewes and Heathens were. Can any alledge the like reason for admitting them to the Sacrament? *Erastus* himself observeth that the unclean under the Law who might not eat of the Passeover, yet were not forbidden but commanded to observe the Sabbath, and the feast of *Expiation*. I mention it onely as an argument *ad hominem*. If a sinner be known for a improfitable hearer of the word, that cannot make it a sinne to me to Preach any more to him. But if he be known to be a Dogg or a Swine in reference to the Sacrament, that will make it a sin to me if I minister the Sacrament to him. The reason is because I am still bound to endevour his conversion (not knowing that he hath blasphemed against the holy Ghost) but I am not bound to give him the seale of remission of sinnes and salvation by Jesus Christ: yea it were sinne to give that Seal to him who is visibly and apparently uncapable of such sweet and comfortable application of Christ. I conclude that the suspending of scandalous persons from the Sacrament, is neither onely nor principally grounded upon the sinne and guilt of eating and drinking unworthily, which will cleave to the unworthy Communicant: but rather (not excluding the other) upon the nature of the Ordinance which is such as cannot admit of the notoriously scandalous to receive, but that holy Ordinance shall thereby be prophaned and made Common; for what can be more contrary to the nature of that Ordinance and to the Institution of Jesus Christ, than to turne the communion of Saints, into the communion of scandalous sinners; and to make that which was instituted for the comfort of those that repent and beleeve, to be a comfort and Seal of Salvation to those who are known by their fruits to have neither Repentance nor Faith, and so to send them away with a good conceit of their spirituall Estate, and thereby to strengthen their hearts and hands in wickednesse?

Confirm. Thes. lib. 2 p. 134. non tamen pro non Iudæo, vel non circumciso, aut pro improbo damnatóe habebatur Cogebatur inbilominus secundùm ritus patrios vivere, Sabbatum custodire, aliáque talia facere. Quinetiam a Sacramento expiationis generalis, quæ die 10. mensis Septembris per agebatur Lev. 17. & 23. immundi nulli excludebantur.

9. The Question is not whether all scandalous persons are to be

be excommunicated and wholly cast out off the Church. The Assemblies Petition was not concerning excommunicating, but concerning suspending from the Sacrament all scandalous Persons. Yet the current of Master *Prynnes* Argumentation both in his Quæries, and in his *Vindication* thereof, for the most part, runneth along against *Excommunication and Suspension from the Sacrament*, as the Tittles likewise doe promise. Which is a fallacy *à conjunctis ad divisa*. And when he debateth so much concerning *excommunication and suspension*, his *and* is either copulative or exegeticall. If copulative, he opposeth no body that I know so much as himself; for I know none that would have all scandalous sinners suspended, to be excommunicated also, except himself. If exegeticall, even so he is contrary to himself, who confesseth that one may be suspended from the Sacrament before he be excommunicated. *vindic p.* 50. 51. And whereas in the latter part of his first Quære, he would drive us to this hard choice, that either a scandalous person must be excommunicated, or not suspended from the Sacrament; He saith it is evident by *Tertullians* Apology *cap.* 39. *& lib. de pœnit.* that scandalous persons were ever excommunicate and wholly cast out of the Church, not barely sequestred from the Sacrament. Whence saith he all the Canonists and Schoolemen determine that an excommunicate person is excluded from the Church and all publike Ordinances. Let the prudent reader observe, that in stead of proving that scandalous persons were wholly cast out of the Church, he tells us out of the Canonists and Schoolemen, that excommunicate persons were wholly cast out of the Church, that is, that those who were cast out of the Church, were cast out of the Church. And for his antiquity, he hath given here no small wound to the Reputation of his skill in Antiquities. Which will more fully appear *Chap.* 17. Meane while, how can any that hath read *Tertullian* or *Cyprian*, not know, that some failings and falls in time of persecution, and other smaller offences, were not punished by excommunication, but by suspension from the Sacrament, till after publike Declaration of Repentance and confession of the offence, the offender was admitted to the Sacrament. And for the

places he citeth, I find in *Tertullians* Book *de pœnitentia* much of that *Exomologesis* and publike Declaration of Repentance, but that all scandalous persons brought under Church-censures were wholly cast out of the Church, I find not; In the 39 *Chapter* of his Apologetick there is no such thing as is alledged, but the contrary plainly intimated, [e] concerning severall degrees of Ecclesiasticall Discipline, and that if any mans offence was so great, as to deserve excommunication, then he was excommunicate and wholly cast out of the Church. And as in the Antient Churches there were, and in the reformed Churches there now are different degrees of censures, according to the different degrees of offences: so in the Jewish Church the like may be observed, both concerning Ceremoniall uncleanesse, and morall offences. Touching the former, that Law *Num.* 5. 2. *command the children of Israel that they put out of the Camp every Leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is defiled by the dead*, hath been understood by the Jewish Doctors *respectivè*, that is, that the Leper was put out of all the three Camps, the Camp of Israel the Camp of the Levites, and the Camp of divine Majesty which was the Tabernacle: he that had an issue might be in the Camp of Israel, but was put out of the other two. He that was defiled by the dead, was onely restrained from the Camp of divine Majesty, for which also see before *Book.* 1. *Chap.* 10. And touching morall offences, there were severall Steps and degrees in the Jewish excommunication, as [f] Master *Selden* hath observed from the Talmudists: for first a man was separate from the Congregation for 30 dayes, and if thereafter he was found obstinate, he was separate for other 30 dayes, and if after 60 dayes he did not repent, then they passed from the lesser excommunication to the greater, that is from *Niddui* and *Shammatha* (as he thinketh) to *Cherem* or *Anathema*. The Author of the Quæries, while he argueth in that first *Quære* against the suspending from the Sacrament of a person not excommunicated nor wholly cast out of the Church, closeth in this particular with them of the Separation (which I beleeve he did it not intend to doe;) for they in one of their Letters in answer

(e) Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes, & censura divina. Nam & judicatur magno cum pondere ut apud certos de Dei conspectu: summumque futuri judicii præjudicium est, si quis ita deliquerit, ut a communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii relegetur.

(f) *De Jure natur. & Gent. lib. 4. cap. 8.*

answer to the second Letter of *Fr. Iunius* written to them, where they bring eleven Exceptions against the Dutch Churches, one of these Exceptions was that *they use a new censure of Suspension, which Christ hath not appointed.* They doe hold Excommunication to be an Ordinance of Christ, but doe reject the distinction of Suspension and Excommunication, as Master *Prynne* doth.

Tenthly, the true state of the present Question is not, whether the Parliament should establish the power of suspending scandalous persons from the Sacrament, as *Iure divino*, (nay, let Divines assert that, and satisfie peoples consciences in it: but let the Parliament speak in an authoritative and legislative way, in adding their civill sanction.) Nor, whether there ought to be any suspension from the Sacrament of scandalous persons, not yet excommunicated and cast out of the Church; and that the Elder-ship should doe it; for the Ordinance of Parliament hath so farre satisfied the desires of the Reverend Assembly and of the generality of godly people, that there is to be a suspension of scandalous persons (not excommunicated) from the Sacrament, and power is granted to the Eldership to suspend from the Sacrament for such scandals as are enumerate in the Ordinances of *Octob.* 20. 1645. and *March.* 14. 1645. Which Ordinances doe appoint that **All Persons** Or **any Person** that shall commit such or such an offence, shall be by the Eldership suspended from the Sacrament, upon confession of the party, or upon the Testimony of two credible witnesses. So that in truth the stream of Master *Prynnes* exceptions runneth against that which is agreed and resolved upon in Parliament: and his arguments (if they prove any thing) must necessarily conclude against that power already granted by Parliament to Elder-ships. And now if he will speak to that point which is in present publike agitation, he must lay aside his Querees and his *Vindication* thereof, and write another Book to prove that the Assembly and other godly ministers and people ought to rest satisfied (in point of conscience) with the power granted to Elderships to suspend from the Sacrament in the enumerate cases, and that there is not the like reason to

keep off scandalous persons from the Sacrament for other scandalls beside these enumerate in the Ordinance of Parliament. Nay, and he must confine himself within a nearower circle, then so; for the Parliament hath been pleased to think of some course for new emergent cases, that the door may not be shut for the future upon the Remonstrances of Elderships concerning cases not expressed. I know the Gentleman is free to choose his own Theme to treat of, and he may handle what cases of Conscience he shall think fit for the Churches edification. But since he professeth in the Conclusion of his foure Questions and in the Preface before his *Vindication*, and in divers other passages, that his scope is to expedite a regular settlement of Church Discipline, without such a power of suspending the scandalous, as is now desired to be setled in the new Elderships, and manifestly reflecteth upon one of the Assemblies Petitions concerning that businesse, as hath been said; yea the first words of his Queres tell us, he spoke to the point in present publike agitation, the case standing thus; I must put him in mind (under favour) that he hath not been a little out of the way, nor a little wide from the mark.

And if the Question were which of these Tenents (Master *Prynnes* or ours,) concerning Suspension, doth best agree with the mind of the Parliament, let us heare their own Ordinance dated *March* 14. 1645. the words are these: *yet were the fundamentalls and substantiall parts of that Government long since setled in persons by and over whom it was to be exercised, and the nature, extent, and respective subordination of their power was limitted and defined; onely concerning the administration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, how all such persons as were guilty of notorious and scandalous Offences might be suspended from it, some difficulty arising, not so much in the Matter it self, as in the Manner, how it should be done, and who should be the Iudges of the Offence: The Lords and Commons having it alwayes in their purpose and Intention, and it being accordingly declared and Resolved by them* **That all sorts of notorious scandalous Offenders should be suspended from the Sacrament**, Which is the very point so much opposed by Master *Prynne*; for the controversie moved by him is not so much

concerning

concerning the manner, or who should be the Judges, as concerning the matter it selfe: he contending that all sorts of notorious scandalous offenders should not be suspended from the Sacrament, but onely such as are excommunicated and excluded from the hearing of the Word, Prayer, and all other publique Ordinances.))

Having now removed so many mistakes of the true state of the question: that which is in controversie is plainly this; Whether according to the word of God there ought to be in the Eldership of Churches a spirituall power and authority, by which they that are called brethren, that is, Church members, or Officers, for the publique scandall of a prophane life, or of pernicious doctrine, or for a private offence obstinately continued in after admonitions, and so growing to a publique scandall, are upon proofe of such scandall to be suspended from the Lords Table untill signes of repentance appeare in them; and if they continue contumacious, are in the name of Jesus Christ to be excommunicate and cut off from all membership and communion with the Church, and their sinnes pronounced to be bound on earth, and by consequence in Heaven, untill by true and sincere repentance they turne to God, and by the declaration of such repentance be reconciled unto the Church. The affirmative is the received doctrine of the reformed Churches, whereunto I adhere. The first part of it concerning Suspension, is utterly denyed by Mr *Prynne*, which breaketh the concatenation and order of Church discipline held forth in the question now stated. Whether he denieth also Excommunication by Elderships to be an Ordinance and Institution of Christ, and onely holdeth it to be lawfull and warrantable by the word of God, I am not certaine. If he do, then he holds the totall negative of this present question. However I am sure he hath gone about to take away some of the principall Scripturall foundations and pillars upon which Excommunication is builded. *As touching the gradation and order in the question as now stated, it is meant *positively* and *exclusively*, that such a gradation not onely may but ought to be observed ordinarily (which Mr *Prynne* denieth) although I deny not that for some publique enormous, haynous abominations,

* Yea now also it appeareth by his *Diotrephes catechised* that he denieth and opposeth Excommunication it selfe, at least under a Christian Magistrate.))

nations, there may be (without such degrees of proceeding) a present cutting off by Excommunication. But this belongs not to the present controversie.

Chap. II.

Whether Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17. *prove Excommunication.*

THe second point of difference is concerning *Matth.* 18. Mr *Prynne* in the first of his foure questions told us that the words *Matth.* 18. 17. *Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, are meant onely of personall private trespasses between man and man, not publique scandalous sinnes against the Congregation: and that tis not said, *Let him be to the whole Church, but let him be to Thee, &c.* This I did in my Sermon retort. For if *to thee*, for a personall private trespasse; much more *to the whole Church*, for a publique scandalous sinne, whereby he trespasseth against the whole Congregation. Yea, it followeth upon his interpretation, that he may account the whole Church as Heathens and Publicans, if all the members of the Church doe him a personall injury, whereupon I left this to be considered by every man of understanding, whether if a private man may account the whole Church as Heathens and Publicans for a personall injury done to himselfe alone, it will not follow that much more the whole Church may account a man as a Heathen and Publican, for a publique scandalous sinne against the whole Church. Mr *Prynne* in his *Vindication*, pag. 3. glanceth at this objection, but he takes notice onely of the halfe of it, and he is so farre from turning off my retortion, that he confirmeth it; for pag. 4. he confesseth that every Christian hath free power by Gods word to esteeme not onely a particular brother, but all the members of a Congregation, as Heathens and Publicans, if he or they continue impenitent in the case of private injuries, after admonition.

Now

Now my exception againſt his *Quere* remains unanſwered. If I may eſteem the whole Church as Heathens and Publicans, when they doe me an injury and continue impenitent therein: may not the whole Church eſteem me as an Heathen man and a Publican, when I commit a publique and ſcandalous treſpaſſe againſt the whole Church, and continues impenitent therein? Shall a private man have power to caſt off the whole Church as Heathens and Publicans? and ſhall not the whole Church have power to caſt off one man as an Heathen and Publican? I know he underſtands thoſe words, *Let him be to thee as a Heathen man and a Publican*, in another ſence then either the reformed Churches doe, or the ancient Churches did, and takes the meaning to be of avoyding fellowſhip and familiarity with him, before any ſentence of Excommunication paſſed againſt the offender. But however my argument from proportion will hold. If civill fellowſhip muſt be refuſed, becauſe of obſtinacy in a civill injury, why ſhall not ſpirituall or Church-fellowſhip be refuſed to him that hath committed a ſpirituall injury or treſpaſſe againſt the Church? If private fellowſhip ought to be denied unto him that will not repent of a private injury, why ſhall not publique fellowſhip in eating and drinking with the Church at the Lords Table be denied unto him that will not repent of a publique ſcandall given to the Congregation? Are the rules of Church fellowſhip looſer and wider than the rules of civill fellowſhip? or are they ſtraiter? Is the way of communion of Saints broader than the way of civill communion? or is it narrower? Peradventure he will ſay, that the whole Church, that is, all the members of the Church, have power to withdraw from an obſtinate ſcandalous brother, that is, to have no fraternall converſe or private Chriſtian fellowſhip with him. Well then: If thus farre he be as a Heathen and a Publican to the whole Church diſtributively, how ſhall he be as a Chriſtian brother to the whole Church collectively; If all the members of the Church ſeverally withdraw fellowſhip from him even before he be excommunicated, how ſhall the whole Church together be bound to keepe fellowſhip with him till he be excommunicated? Inſtead of looſing ſuch knots, Mr *Brynne* undertakes to prove another thing, that this Text

of

of *Matthew* is not meane of Excommunication or Church censures, and that the Church in this Text was not any Ecclesiasticall Consistory (here he citeth *Josephus*, as if he had spoken of that Text) but onely the Sanhedrin or Court of civill Justice. But though all this were true which he saith, yet there may be a good argument drawn by necessary consequence from this Text to prove Excommunication. Which *Grotius* did well perceive: for in his annotations upon the place, after he hath told his opinion that excommunication is not meant in this Text, he addeth, that he hath elsewhere spoken of the antiquity and necessity of Excommunication: *quanquam ad eam ex hoc etiam loco non absurde argumentum duci posse, non negaverim: though I will not deny*, saith he, *that even from this place, the argument may be drawn to excommunication without any absurdity.* My argument afore-mentioned will hold good even from Master *Prynnes* owne exposition. Thus farre I have gone upon a confession: now to the confutation. Before I come to his reasons, I observe in his margent a double mistake of the testimony of *Scapula*. First, he sends us to *Scapula* to learn that ἐκκλησία signifieth any civill assembly or councell, as well as an Ecclesiasticall Presbytery. Yes: *Scapula* tels us, it hath in Heathen writers a generall signification, to expresse any Assembly called forth. But he addeth immediately, that in the writing of Christians it signifieth the assembly of such as are called to eternall life and doe professe Christian Religion. Since therefore it hath not the same signification in Heathen writings, and in the New Testament, he should have shewed us where the word ἐκκλησία in the new Testament doth signifie a civill Court of Justice. I hope the holy Ghost did speake so in this place as he might be understood, and to take the word *Church* here, in that sence which it hath nowhere else in the new Testament, doth not agree with that received maxime, That Scripture is to be expounded by Scripture. I finde indeed the word ἐκκλησία used for a Civill assembly, *Acts* 19.39,41. But as that is an Heathen assembly, so it is not the Evangelist *Luke* his expression otherwise then *recitative*: that is, he mentioneth an Heathen assembly under that name by which Heathens themselves called it. His other mistake of *Scapula*, is, the citing of him for that assertion,

tion, that the Church in this Text is not an Eccleſiaſticall Con ſiſtory. Whereas *Scapula* doth expound the Church *Matth.* 18. to be meant of the Presbytery or Colledge of Elders, (as g *Stephani Theſaurus* doth alſo) and having told that the word ſignifieth the whole Chriſtian Church: alſo particular Congregations: he addeth two more reſtricted ſignifications: ſometimes it ſignifieth a Chriſtian family: ſometimes the Presbytery; for this laſt he citeth *Matth.* 18. Now I proceed to Mr *Prynnes* Reaſons. Firſt, ſaith he, this Text *ſpeakes not at all of any publique ſcandalous ſinne againſt the Church or Congregation, the proper object of Church cenſures, but onely of private civill treſpaſſes between man and man, as is evident by the words, If thy brother treſpaſſe againſt thee, goe and tell him his fault between him and thee, &c.* *Anſw.* We have ever underſtood that place of ſuch treſpaſſes, which grow publique afterwards by the offenders obſtinacy after admonition. Yet the treſpaſſe here meant, may be often ſuch as even at firſt is ſcandalous to more then one. Such a caſe falleth under Chriſts rule here, and is not excluded. Wherein obſerve *Durand* upon the fourth Book of the Maſter of Sentences *Diſt.* 19. *Queſt.* 4. *But if,* ſaith he, *the ſinne be not altogether ſecret, nor altogether knowne, that is, ſuch as is known to many by whom he may be convict, or he is ill reported of among grave perſons, though the publique fame be not againſt him, ſo the procedor which Chriſt hath ſet us in the Goſpell, ſeemeth to have place, to wit, that firſt he may be ſecretly admoniſhed, concerning his amendment; which if it profit not, that he may be admoniſhed concerning his amendment before thoſe who know the fact; but if that alſo doe not profit, that then he may be declared to the Church.* But if we ſhould grant that no other treſpaſſe is meant here, but a private treſpaſſe, yet I aske, is there no private treſpaſſe but that which is civill? The Schoolmen writing *de ſcandalo* will tell him that one brother treſpaſſeth againſt another when he ſcandalizeth him by any ſinfull example, though without any civill injury. Nay its the greateſt treſpaſſe which is committed againſt the ſoule of our neighbour: ſcandall is ſoule murther. It is a breach of the Law of love, not onely by omiſſion, but by commiſſion. He that is commanded to edifie his brother, and then giveth ſcandall to him, doth he not treſpaſſe againſt his brother? The like an-

g *Steph. Reſtringitur & alio modo ἐκκλησία ad ſynedrium ſeu Presbyterium, id eſt ſeniorum collegium, ut Matth.* 18. So *Marlorat in Theſauro* ſaith that the word *Eccleſia* is taken *proſenusa Eccleſiaſtico Matth.* 18. 17.

swer I return to that which he addeth, that *Luke relating* the same thing *without any Dic Ecclesiæ, Luk.*17.3,4 *puts it out of question, if compared with Gen.*52.31.(there is no such Scripture) 1 *Sam.*25. 28. What? out of question. Doth he not find scandalous sins in the two verses immediately preceding in *Luke*, and thereupon its immediatly added, *Take heed to your selves, if thy brother trespasse against thee, rebuke him, and if he repent, forgive him.* Can not a Christian rebuke his brother who scandalizeth him, and if he repent forgive him? *Luke* needed not adde *Dic Ecclesiæ*, because he speaks of a repenting brother, not of an impenitent brother, after private admonition. And that scandalous trespasses are understood *Matth.*18.19. (as *Augustine*, *Tostatus*, and many others have observed) may thus appeare. 1. Scandals are the greatest and worst trespasses, as hath been said, and *woe unto the world because of offences.* Surely Jesus Christ did intend to provide a remedy against the greatest evils, rather than against the lesser. 2. Christ would not be Judge of civill injuries, *Luke* 12.14. How can it be then supposed that he giveth here Lawes concerning civill rather then spirituall injuries? 3. Christ saith, *If he shall heare* (not repaire) *thee, thou hast gained* (not thy goods or thy good name, or the like, but) *thy brother.* Intimating, that its not a mans owne intereſt, but the rescuing of his brothers soule from sinne and scandall, which is here sought. Mr *Prynne* himselfe confirmeth it not a little, for he takes the meaning to be of avoyding a brothers company, in the case of a civill or private injury, if he *continue impenitent after admonition.* Now what if he that hath done the injury make full reparation, and all reall satisfaction to the brother injured, and yet continue impenient shewing no symptome at all of repentance, must he not by Mr *Prynnes* exposition be esteemed as an heathen man and a Publican, because of his visible and scandalous impenitency? How often hath it been seen that a man was compelled by Law, or perswaded by friends to make a reall restitution and full satisfaction for a civill or personall injury; and yet hath given very great scandall by his impenitency, not so much as confessing, but still defending and justifying his sinfull act, in his discourses? 4. The dependency upon the preceding parts of that Chapter confirmeth it: from the beginning of

the

the Chapter to this very Text, verſ. 15. Chriſt hath been upon the doctrine of ſcandals, warning us not to offend ſo much as one of his little ones, which he preſſeth by divers arguments. 5. The Eraſtians and we doe both agree in this, that Chriſt here hath a reſpect to the Jewiſh Government. Now the treſpaſſes for which men were excommunicate by the Jewiſh Sanhedrin were ſcandalous treſpaſſes, ſuch as the deſpiſing of any of the precepts of the law of *Moſes*, or Statutes of the Scribes: The doing of ſervile worke upon Eaſter Eve: The mentioning of the Name of God raſhly, or by a vaine oath: The inducing of others to prophane the Name of God, or to eate holy things without the holy place; and the like; More of this elſewhere, in the 24 cauſes of the Jewiſh Excommunication. 6. Mr *Prynne* expoundeth this Text in *Matthew* by 1 *Cor.* 5. 9, 10, 11, 12. but there the Apoſtle intends the purging of the Chuch from ſcandals, whether thoſe ſcandals have any private injury in them or not. Inſtance in Idolatry and drunkenneſſe, there mentioned. 7. I can alſo (without yeelding the leaſt advantage to the Eraſtian cauſe) admit and ſuppoſe that which is ſo much preſſed both by *Eraſtus*, Mr *Prynne*, and others, *viz.* that theſe words, *If thy brother treſpaſſe againſt thee*, are ſpoken of a perſonall injury between man and man, Though I doe not grant the thing, yet I am content, even upon their own ſuppoſition, to argue from this Text. And firſt, it may be anſwered with *Aegidius de Coninck. de actib. ſupernat. Diſp.* 28. *Dub.* 8. that Chriſt doth not ſpeake of the caſe of perſonall injuries, as if he meant to reſtrict unto ſuch caſes the order of proceeding for gaining of the offenders ſoule from ſinne; [h] *but onely for examples ſake he brought ſuch kind of ſinne, of which it might have been moſt doubted, whether in the reproofe thereof this order be to be kept, and in which it can be moſt hardly obſerved, in reſpect of the innate deſire of revenge in many.* 2. Let our oppoſites themſelves ſay, whether we ought not in conſcience and duty, endeavour the gaining of an offending brothers ſoule, when we ſee him commit a treſpaſſe againſt God, which is no perſonall injury to our ſelves, as well as when the treſpaſſe is a perſonall injury. 3. As this order of proceeding here preſcribed by Chriſt, is (in the caſe of a perſonall injury) the greateſt triall of Chriſtian love in

[h] Sed ſolùm exempli cauſa attulit talis genus peccati, de quò maximè poterat dubitari, an in ejus correptione hic ordo ſervandus ſit, & in quò difficillimè ſervetur, ob innatam multis cupiditatem vindictæ.

in the person offended, so it may (by Gods blessing) be the stronger and more efficacious upon the person offending, to conquer and overcome his spirit, while he that might prosecute him in a legall and criminall way, commeth in meeknesse and love to admonish him, and to endeavour the gaining of him from sin by repentance. Which is the observation of *Chrysostome* upon the place, *for if he that might demand punishment upon him, even that man be seen to be taking care of his salvation, this most of all other things is able to make him ashamed, and to yeeld.* 4. If it be a civill and personall injury matterially, yet it comes not in here under that formall consideration, but partly as a scandall to him that hath received the injury (so that *Chrysostome* doth rightly make this Text to hang together with that which was said before in the same Chapter concerning scandals) partly as a soul-destroying sinne upon him that doth the wrong, which doth endanger his salvation: And if under such a notion private injuries be here spoken of, then what have our opposites gained? 5. The scope also is not civill but wholly spirituall; which *Chrysostome* doth very well explaine. *Hom. 66. in Matth. What is it*, if he shall heare thee? *if he shall be perswaded to condemne himselfe of sinne.* Thou hast gained thy brother, *he saith not thou hast a sufficient punishment or satisfaction, but thou hast gained thy brother.* And after, *He saith not accuse, nor censure, nor demand punishments, but convince, saith he.* The Context confirmeth it; for these words are added immediately after the parable of bringing home the lost sheep. Which parable we have also *Luke* 15. (where it is not applied to the reducing of such as have done private injuries, but of Publicans and sinners who were publiquely scandalous: this I thought good to note by the way) *Ammonius Alexandrinus de Quatuor Evang. consonantia, cap. 96, 97.* doth together with the parable of the lost sheep, adde also the other two, of the lost penny, and the lost sonne, immediately before these words, *If thy brother trespasse against thee &c.* 6. And suppose that the businesse hath its rise and beginning from a personall injury, verse 15. yet the trespasse for which the man is to be held as a Heathen and Publican, is a publique scandalous sinne against the Church or Congregation, namely his neglecting to heare the

Church

Church *verſ.* 17. for it is not his firſt treſpaſſe, but his contumacy againſt the Church, which by this Text is to make him eſteemed as an Heathen and a Publican.

Before I leave this point, I will anſwer the chief Argument by which *Erastus* would prove that this Text is meant only of private civill injuries: becauſe (ſaith he) the treſpaſſe here ſpoken of is no other then what one brother may forgive to another. I anſwer, both he and Maſter *Prynne* doe ſuppoſe this Text *Mat.* 15, 16, 17. to be parallell to that in *Luk.* 17. 3. 4. which they take for granted, without proof or reaſon. Certainly there is a great difference between the purpoſe and ſcope of the one place and of the other. It will be replyed that even in this very Chapter *Matth.* 18. the next thing which follows *verſ.* 21. is concerning perſonall injuries which one brother can and ought to forgive to another. *Then came* Peter *to him and ſaid, Lord how oft ſhall my Brother ſinne againſt me, and I forgive him? &c.* To that I anſwer. 1. We cannot gather from the Text that *Peter* did propound this queſtion immediately after or upon occaſion of that which went before *verſ.* 15, 16, 17, &c. where nothing is ſpoken of one Brothers forgiving another. We read *Luk.* 8. 19. *Then came to him his Mother and his Brethren, &c.* yet the meaning is not that his Mother and his Brethren came to him immediately after his ſpeaking of the words before mentioned by *Luke* in that place; for that it was not after theſe, but after other words, is plain from the Harmony of the other Evangeliſts *Matthew* and *Mark.* So here theſe words *Then came Peter*, may very well relate to a new buſineſſe and to another time. 2. Or if it was the ſame time, it might be ſaid, *Then came Peter*, that is, *Peter* being abſent, and not having heard that which Chriſt had been before ſpeaking, he came immediatly after, & did propound a new Queſtion. 3. Suppoſe alſo that *Peter* was preſent and heard all which had been before ſpoken, yet it is much doubted among Interpreters, whence *Peter* had the riſe and occaſion of that Queſtion. Some think it was upon his calling to minde thoſe words in the rule of Prayer, *even as we forgive thoſe who treſpaſſe againſt us.* Others conceive the occaſion of his Queſtion was that which was ſaid *verſ.* 19. *Againe I ſay unto you if two of you ſhall agree on earth*, ſuppoſing that agreement (and

consequently forgiving of injuries) is necessary to make our Prayers the more effectuall; for my part, I think it not improbable that whatever the occasion of the Question was, *vers.* 21 beginneth a new and distinct purpose. Which I take to be the reason why the Arabik here makes an intercision, and beginneth the eight and fiftieth Section of *Matthew* at those words, *Then came* Peter *and said, Lord how oft, &c.* 4. And if *vers.* 21. have a dependence upon that which went before, it may be conceived thus: Christ had said, *If thy Brother trespasse against thee, goe & tell him his fault betweene thee and him alone,* which supposeth a continuance of the former Christian fellowship and fraternall familiarity, and that we must not cast off a scandalous Brother as lost, or as an Enemy, but admonish him as a Brother. This might give occasion to *Peter* to aske, *Lord how oft shall my Brother sinne against me,* that is, scandalize me by his sinne against God, (for even in *Luk.* 17. 3. 4. that of forgiving one that trespasseth against us, is added immediately after a Doctrine of scandals;) *and I forgive him,* that is, as *Grotius* expounds it, restore him to the former degree of friendship and intimate familiarity, to deale with him thus as with a Brother; Which he well distinguisheth from that other forgiving which is a not revenging. And so much of Master *Prynnes* first reason.

His second reason is because the Mention of two or three witnesses *vers.* 16. relateth *onely to the manner of trying civill capitall crimes (as murders and the like) before the civill Magistrates of the Iewes, &c. not to any proceedings in Ecclesiasticall causes, in their Ecclesiasticall Consistories, of which we find no president.*

Answ. 1. If this hold, then the Text must not be expounded indefinitely of civill injuries (as he did before) but of civill capitall injuries, whereas *Erastus* takes the meaning to be of smaller offences onely, and not of Capitall crimes. 2. The Law concerning two or three witnesses is neither restricted to Capitall crimes, nor to civill Judicatories. I appeale to the Ordinance of Parliament dated *Octo.* 20. 1645. *The Elder-ship of every Congregation shall judge the matter of scandall aforesaid, being not Capitall, upon the Testimony of two credible Witnesses, at the least.* That Law therefore of witnesses is alike applicable to all causes and

and Courts Eccleſiaſticall and civill *Deut.* 19. 30. *One witneſſe ſhall not riſe up againſt a man for any iniquity, or for any ſinne, in any ſin that he ſinneth: at the mouth of two witneſſes or at the mouth of three witneſſes ſhall the matter be eſtabliſhed.* 3. And the ſame Law is in the new Teſtament clearly applied to proceedings in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes 2 *Cor.* 13. 1. & again 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. *Againſt the Elder receive not an accuſation but before two or three witneſſes*; which is not ſpoken to any civill Magiſtrate, but to *Timothy* and others joyned with him in Church Government.

His third reaſon doth onely begge what is in Queſtion, that by the Church is not meant any Eccleſiaſticall but a civill Court of the Jewes. He needed not to cite ſo many places to prove that the Jewes had civill Courts. If he could but cite one place, to prove that they had no Eccleſiaſticall Courts, this were to the purpoſe. Not that I grant that at this time the Jewes had any civill Jurisdiction or Jewiſh Court of Juſtice; for after that *Herod* the great did kill *Hircanus* and the *Sanhedrin*, (in the opinion of many learned men) the Jewes had no more any civill Juriſdiction. Now *Herod* the great was dead before the time of Chriſts Miniſtery. Others think they had ſome civill Jurisdiction a while after *Hircanus* death. How ever he cannot prove, that at this time when Chriſt ſaid *Tell the Church*, the Jewes had any civill Court of Juſtice, which did exerciſe either Criminall or Capitall Judgements. I have in the firſt Book ſhewed out of *Buxtorf*, *L' Empereur*, *Caſaubon*, and *I. Coch.* (who prove what they ſay from the Talmudicall writers) that 40 yeeres before the deſtruction of the Temple (and ſo before Chriſt ſaid *Tell the Church*) the Court of civill Juſtice at *Hieruſalem* did ceaſe. If Maſter *Pryne* make any thing of this Gloſſe of his, he muſt prove 1. That there was no Eccleſiaſticall Court among the Jewes. (I have before proved that that Councell of the Jewes in Chriſts time was an Eccleſiaſticall Court, though he conceives it was meerely civill) 2. That a private civill injury might not then, nor may not now, be brought before a civill Court, except after ſeverall previous admonitions deſpiſed. 3. That Chriſts Rule, *Tell the Church* was antiquated and ceaſed, when a civill Court of Juſtice among the Jewes ceaſed. If he ſay that the ſame rule continueth.

eth for telling the civill Magistrate in case the offender prove obstinate after admonition, then I aske. 1. how will he reconcile himself? for *pag.* 4. he saith the Church in this Text is *onely the Sanhedrin or Court of civill Iustice among the Jewes.* 2. If this Text *Mat.* 18. was applicable to the primitive Church after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and when there was no Jewish *Sanhedrin* to goe to, then the Pagan Magistracy must passe under the name of the Church, for they had no other civill Court of Justice to goe to.

(i) *Confirm. Thesium lib.* 2. cap. 2. Quis nescit illo tempore Judæos sub Romanis vixisse, ac præsidem eorum perentibus omnibus jus dicere solitum fuisse? Civilem potentiam ad se omnem fere perraxerant, relicta potestate ipsis de rebus sacris judicandi, & secundum legis ceremonias vivendi. *Idem lib.* 3, *cap.* 1. Interim tamen parebant Romanis: neque in aliis rebus potestatem servaverant integram, quàm in rebus ad religionem moréque patrios pertinentibus.

One thing I must needs take notice of, that whereas he would prove here that *Tell the Church*, is nothing, but, tell the civill Court of Justice among the Jewes, commonly called the Councell saith he, or *Sanhedrin*, he doth hereby overthrow all that he hath been building: for the Jewish *Sanhedrin* at that time, had not power to judge civill, nor criminall, and least of all Capitall offences, but onely causes Ecclesiasticall: The *Romans* having taken from them their civill Government, and left them no Government nor Jurisdiction except in matters of Religion. I hope Master *Prynne* will not in this contradict (i) *Erastus.* And if so, how shall his Gloss stand, that this Text is to be understood of civill injuries, yea, and of these onely, for remedy whereof he conceives that Christ sends his Disciples to the Jewish *Sanhedrin?* How sweetly doe his Tenents agree together?

His fourth reason is, that those words, *let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, cannot signifie excommunication, *because Heathen men being never members of the Church, could never be excommunicated or cast out of it, being uncapable of such a censure. As for publicans, those of them who were members of the Iewish Church, though they were execrable to the Jewes, by reason of their Tax-gatherings and oppressions, yet we never read in Scripture, that they were excommunicated or cast out of their Synagogues, but contrarily, that they went up into the Temple to pray, as well as the Pharisees, and were more acceptable to Christ himself, &c.* So likewise *Sutlivius* (against *Beza*) *de presyt.* Cap. 9. pag. 57. I answer 1. by a retortion. Master *Prynne* p. 4. expounds these words, *let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a publican*, to be meant of avoiding familiar fellowship with the Brother that hath committed

mitted a civill treſpaſſe, and keeping no more civill company with him. Now I argue thus *ad hominem.* This cannot be the meaning which he gives, becauſe Heathens being never admitted into familiar fellowſhip and company with the Jewes (who might not marry nor familiarly converſe with them, as himſelf proveth *pag.* 4.) could never be caſt out of their fellowſhip and company, being uncapable of any ſuch thing. If our expoſition of excommunication muſt drive us to acknowledge that Heathens were formerly members of the Jewiſh Church, his expoſition of avoiding familiar fellowſhip, muſt drive him to acknowledge that formerly the Heathens were admitted into familiar fellowſhip with the Jewes.

2. Thoſe words ἔστω σοι, *let him be unto thee*, &c. do not look backward but foreward; neither is the matching and comparing of the ſcandalous impenitent Brother, with an heathen, *à priori*, but *à poſteriori*, ſo that no compariſon is to be made between the præterite Eſtate of an offending Brother, and the præterite Eſtate of an Heathen man, but between the future Eſtate of an offending obſtinate Brother, and the preſent Eſtate of an Heathen man.

3. *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen*, is as much as have no communion nor fellowſhip with him in the holy Aſſemblies nor in the Temple; for Heathens were not permitted to come into the Temple *Ezek.* 44. 7. 9. *Act.* 21. 28. whereupon *Paul* is accuſed for bringing Greeks into the Temple and ſo polluting that holy place *Act.* 21. 28. Heathens were excluded from *Atrium Iſraelis*, the Court of Iſrael, which was without the Court of the Prieſts. There was without the Court of Iſrael, *Atrium Gentium*, the Court of the Heathen, otherwiſe called *Intermurale*, becauſe it lay between the Temple and the utter wall mentioned *Ezek.* 42. 20. Into this utmoſt Court or *intermurale* Heathen men were admitted to come and worſhip there, according to that 1 *Kings.* 8. 41. 2 *Chro.* 6. 32. They might not onely come into the holy Land, but to the holy City, and not onely to the holy City, but to the mountain of the houſe of the Lord, yea, not onely to the mountaine of the Temple, but within the utter Wall: yet into the Court of Iſrael which was properly the firſt or utter Court of the Temple, they were forbidden to

enter. He that would be further satisfied that these things were so, let him read *Ioseph. antiq. lib.* 15. *cap.* 14. *Tostatus in* 1. *Reg.* 8. *quæst.* 21. *Arias Montanus de sacr. fabric.* pag. 15. *Azorius Instit. moral. Tom.* 1. *lib.* 6. Chap. 53. *L' Empereur Annot. in Cod. Middoth* cap. 2. Sect. 3. Peradventure you will say, if it was thus, then an excommunicate person being esteemed as an Heathen, must not get leave to heare the word, nor at all to enter into the places of publike Assemblies where the word was Preached. Answ. I will not now debate that point. Others have debated it with the Anabaptists who hold that excommunicate persons ought not be admitted to the Hearing of the word. *Luc. Osiand. Enchirid. contra Anab. c.* 6. *quæst.* 2. but however it doth not follow upon what I have said, that excommunicate persons must be wholly excluded from hearing of the word. First, because the places of our publike worship have no Sacramentall significancy or holinesse as the Temple and Tabernacle had of old: therefore say the professors of *Leyden* there is not the like reason to exclude excommunicate persons wholly from our Temples, as there was excluding them from the Temple of *Ierusalem*. 2. because both Christ *Io.* 10. 23. and the Apostles *Acts* 5. 12. did use to Preach in *Solomons* Porch, (b) This Porch so called was the great east Porch in the *Intermurale*, whether Heathens were admitted, and so they did hear the word, though they had no leave to come into the Court of Israel, there to have fellowship with or to be esteemed and reputed among the people of God. Yea, as Master *Selden* tells us *de Iure nat. & Gent. lib.* 3. cap. 6. some understand by *Solomons* Porch *act.* 3. 11. & 5. 12. the very Court of the Gentiles, into which they came to worship, which Gentiles were not withstanding forbidden by a superscription under paine of death to enter into the Court of Israel, or into that which *Iosephus* calls the second Temple. *Iosephus* doth also make mention of foure Porches of the Temple; into the utmost of which (& this is certainly meant of *Solomons* porch) it was lawful for heathens to come. *contra appron. l.* 2.

b *Iosephus antiq. lib.* 20. *cap.* 8. Suasit (populus) regi ut orientalem instauraret porticum. Ea templi extima claudebat, profundæ valli & angustæ imminens, &c. Opus Solomonis regis, qui primus integrum Templum condidit.

4. For the other part, *let him be unto thee as a publican*, if the meaning were no more but this avoid all fellowship and familiarity with him, it doth not hurt our Exposition: exclusion from the Temple being clearly signified by his being *as an Heathen*:

then: and avoiding of fellowship with him being in the most emphaticall manner further expressed by his being as a publican; both these put together do the more fully hold forth excommunication. And in this sence some resolve the words.

5. Yet let us see how Master *Pryune* proves that the Publicans were admitted into the Temple or Synagogues. He tells us that Christ received them or conversed with them, as if the meaning had been to compare an impenitent Brother with penitent publicans, *Luk.* 18. 13. who drew neer to Christ to heare him *Luk.* 15. 2. who left all and followed Christ to be among his disciples *Matth.* 10. 3. *Luk.* 5. 27, 28. *Mark.* 2. 15. who justified God *Luk.* 7. 29. who knew themselves to be sick of soule-diseases Matth. 9. 12, 13. These very places cited by himself make against him. However the Question is how Publicans were esteemed of in the Jewish Church (for that is the thing pointed at in those words, *let him be unto thee as a Publican*) for that, he objecteth that Publicans went up into the Temple to pray. If he meane that Publicans who were neither devout Jewes nor Proselytes, went up into the Temple to pray, had accesse to and fellowship in the Sacrifices and Temple worship, as well as the Jewes themselves, its more than he can prove. If he mean that publicans who were Jewes or Proselytes, went up into the Temple to pray, it helpeth him not, except he can prove that when Christ saith, *let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a publican*, the meaning is of such a publican as was a devout Jew or proselyte. And if so, then he had to prove that the Jewes did not keep civill company or fellowship, so much as with the religious publicans with whom they went together to the Temple to pray and worship. This also he hath to prove, not that religious publicans (of whom Christ means not) but that impious infamous Publicans came to the Temple.

6. That passage *Luke* 18.10. concerning the Publicans goe ing up to the Temple to pray; first, it is expressely declared to be a parable Vers. 9. and therefore can not prove the reality of the thing according to the letter, no more than an audible conference between *Abraham* and the rich man in Hell can be proved from *Luke* 16. 24. to the end of the Chapter, (though I believe that be a History related parabolically, as *Vossius* proveth

proveth in his *Theses:*) farre lesse can a parable properly so called prove an historicall narration. The meaning may be no other but this, that if such a Publican and such a Pharisee should goe up to the Temple to pray, then the one should depart justified, and the other not.

7. I can also grant without any prejudice to the businesse of Excommunication that the Publican, yea an execrable Publican did goe up to the Temple to pray. For an excommunicate person among the Jewes (as many thinke) so long as there was hope of his repentance, had leave to come into the utter Court of the Temple, yet so that they came in at the gate of the mourners, and excommunicate persons were known by all
11 that saw them, to be excommunicate persons. More of this *Booke* 1. *cap.* 4.

8. This very Text *Luke* 18. helpes us. For tis said Vers. 13. *The Publican stood afarre off*, that is, (in the opinion of *Diodati*) *in some remote part of the first Court of the Temple*, 1 *Kings* 8. 41. It is very probable (whereof see *Book* 1. *chap.* 9. that the *Intermurale* or *atrium Gentium* is meant, which sometime hath the name of the Temple. To the Publicans standing afarre off is opposed the Pharisees standing by himselfe, Vers. 11. where I construct πρὸς ἑαυτὸν with σταθεὶς as *Camero* doth: So *Camerarius* and *Beza* following the Syriack and some old Greek copies: he stood apart by himselfe, the very custome making it so, that the Publican should not come neere him, but stand *in atrio Gentium*.

9. The reason why Publicans are named as hatefull and execrable persons, was not for civill respects, nor because Publicans, (for the Jewes themselves did not refuse to keep company with good and just Publicans, as I shall prove afterwards:) particularly, it was not for their Tax-gathering (a particular mentioned by Mr *Prynne*, it seems to strengthen his exposition of civill injuries) but for divers scandalous sinnes and abominable prophanesse, therefore *publicans and sinners*, *publicans and harlots*, *publicans and gluttons*, *and wine-bibbers* are almost synonyma's in the Gospell, *Matth.* 9. 11. & 11. 19. & 21. 32. *Marke* 2. 16. *Luke* 5. 30. and Publicans are named as the worst of men, *Matth.* 5. 46, 47. the most of them being so reputed. From

al

all this which hath been said in answer to his fourth reason it appeareth that *let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican*, is more than he would make it, keepe not any familar company, or have no civill fellowship with him. And whereas page 4. he saith that *Paul* expresly interprets it so, 1 *Cor.* 5.10,11,12. 2 *Thess* 3.4. *Ephes.* 5.11. *Rom.* 16.17. I answer out of himselfe, in that same place, and pag.5. *Let him be to thee as an Heathen, &c.* is a phrase never used elsewhere in Scripture. How then, saith he, that *Paul* doth expresly interpret it? *Paul* commandeth to withdraw fellowship, (and that for any scandalous sin in a Church-member, although it be no private injury to us, as the places quoted by himselfe make it manifest) Therefore *Paul* doth expresly interpret that phrase *Mat.* 18. to be meant of withdrawing civill fellowship only. What consequence is there here?

I come to his fifth and last reason, *the words runne only, Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican, not to the whole Church.* Answ. 1. This is the very thing he said in his first *Quære*, which is answered before. I shall onely adde here another answer out of [1] *Erastus*, who argueth thus: One brother should forgive another seventy times in a day, if the offending brother doe so oft turn againe and crave pardon: Therefore so should the Church doe to a sinner that craveth pardon, even as often as he doth crave pardon. For (saith he) there can be no just reason given wherefore the whole Church ought not to doe herein, what Church members ought to doe severally. If this be a good argument when Christ saith, *If thy brother repent, forgive him, Luke* 17.3,4. (by which place Mr *Prynne* expoundeth *Matth.* 18. 15.) will it not be as good an argument, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican*, therefore let him be such to the whole Church, when the whole Church is offended by his obstinacy and impenitency?

[1] *Erast Confirm. Thes. lib. 2. pag.* 158. Quod uni dictum est, dictum toti est ecclesiæ. At uni dictum est ut septuagies in die culpam deprecanti remittat. Ergo tota Ecclesia deprecanti ignoscere debet, quotiescunque in die sibi ignosci petet. Nulla enim justa causa proferri poterit, cur tota Ecclesia non debeat facere in hac causa, quod singulis ejus membris præceptum est.

2. Those words, *Let him be to thee*, cannot be restrictive. It must be at least extended to all such as are commanded to rebuke their brother, and if he continue obstinate to tell the Church. Now the commandement for rebuking our brother that fals into a scandalous sinne, is not restricted to him that is personally or particularly wronged, but it is a common Law of spirituall love, *Levit.* 19.17. Yea, saith Mr *Hildersham*, lect.

le 7.36. on *Psal.*51. *Every man hath received a commandement from Christ, to informe the governours of the Church of such a brother as cannot otherwise be reformed, Matth.*18.17. *Tell the Church.* If it belong to every Church member to reprove a scandalous sinne which his brother committeth in his sight or hearing, or to his knowledge, and if he repent not, to tell the Church, then it also belongs to every Church member to esteeme him as an Heathen man and a Publican, if he heare not the Church.

3. The next words, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth shall be bound in Heaven*, being spoken to the Apostles, and in them to other Ministers of Jesus Christ, doe expound the former words *Let him be unto thee, &c.* to be meant not of private withdrawing of fellowship, but of a publique Church censure.

4. The reason why Christ will have such an offender to be esteemed as an Heathen man and a Publican, is not the offence and fault first committed, but his obstinacy and contumacy in that offence, and his neglecting to heare the Church. So that suppose the offence had been a private or personall injury; yet that for which the offender is to be esteemed as an Heathen and a Publican, toucheth the whole Church, and is a generall scandall to them all, namely his contumacy and not hearing the Church. How can it then be imagined, that Christ would onely have one Church member to esteem a man as an Heathen and a Publican, for that which is a common generall scandall to the whole Church? [m] *Munsterus* in his Annotations upon *Matth.*18. doth better hit the meaning, that the offender is to be esteemed as an Heathen man and a Publican, by those who did before admonish him but were despised, that is, by the Church, whose admonitions being despised, they ought to cast out him who had despised them.

5. And how can it be supposed, that Christ would have one and the same person to be as a Heathen man and a Publican to one member of the Church, and yet not to be as a Heathen man and a Publican, but as a brother received in fellowship by the whole Church? Sure this were a repugnancy between the judgement of the whole Church, and the judgement of one member of the Church: and two things which are

[m] Quod si hos contemnat, indicetur Ecclesiæ ejus pervicatia. Et si ne Ecclesiam audierit, monitus scilicet à multis, habeatur ab eis veluti ethnicus & publicanus. Et quæcunque illi sic ligaverint, ligata habebuntur in cælis, hoc est, quos ita monitos ejecerint è suo consortio, ii etiam apud patrem ejecti habebuntur.

are repugnant can not be both of them agreeable to the will of Christ.

Chap. III.

A further demonstration that these words, Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican, *are not meant of avoyding Civill, but Religious or Church-fellowship.*

I Hope I have already made it to appeare that to draw Excommunication from *Matth.* 18. is not to extract water out of flint, as Mr *Prynne* supposeth: but that it commeth as *liquidè* from the Text, as water out of the fountaine. Wherein I am the more confirmed, because Mr *Prynnes* exposition of these words, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican,* can not stand, for he takes the sence to be no more but this, keepe not any civill fellowship or company with such a one. Now that this can not be our Saviours meaning, I prove thus.

1. If a private man shall thus at his owne hand withdraw and separate from an offending brother, as from an Heathen man and a Publican, [n] what order, peace, or good government can there be either in Church or State? And all the *odium* cast upon Excommunication (as contrary to the spirituall priviledges of Christians) will fall more heavy upon his owne way, which brings any man (be he Prince, Parliament-man, Pastor, or whoever he be) under so much slavery to the lust of any private person, that he may be by that person (and by ten thousand persons more, in case of so many civill injuries, not amended after complaint to the Magistrate) esteemed, avoyded, and abhorred, as an Heathen man and a Publican. So that in the issue it may fall out, that any man how eminent or deserving soever he be in Church or State, may be looked upon as a Heathen and a Publican by ten thousand of the people, before ever he be so judged by any Judicature. For instance, put case that

n *Martyr in* 1 *Cor.* 5. *ult. loc. de excom.* Verum si hoc pro suo arbitrio cuique permittatur, ut facultatem habeat discedendi & separandi se à quibus voluerit, simultates, contentiones, & discordiæ, longè graviores orientur, quàm si publicâ excommunicatione urerentur.

that a Minister be judicially convict to have wronged his parishioners in the matter of small tythes, and they conceive him to persevere in the same injury, must or may each of them flee from him as from an Heathen and a Publican? Put case a whole company thinke themselves wronged in pay or otherwise by their Captaine, or a whole Regiment by their Colonell, and after complaint made finde themselves not repaired, are they therefore free to avoyd all civill company with the Captaine or Colonell, and to flee from them as from Heathens and Publicans? And what if both the Lord Major of *London* and many godly Ministers who have eate at his Table, should accuse Mr. *Prynne* of a calumny, because of that passage in his Booke, pag. 12. where he saith of Anabaptists, Separatists, Independents, Presbyters or Divines, *Neither of which make any conscience of not repairing to the Lord Majors, or any other publique City feast, where they are sure of good fare, because they were certaine there to meet and eate with some covetous or other scandalous persons, with whom St. Paul prohibtes them, no not to eate?* If, I say, the Lord Major should accuse Mr *Prynne* for slandering him and his house with the company of scandalous persons: and if many godly conscientious Ministers should accuse him for aspersing them, as having more love to good fare, then conscience of avoyding to eate with scandalous persons: And if after sentence past against Mr *Prynne* he should still continue impenitent and not confesse his fault in this particular? Will he allow the Lord Major, and all the godly Ministers who have eaten at the Lord Majors table to avoyd Mr *Prynne* as an Heathen and a Publican? Let hm take heed whether his principles will lead him.

2. Mr *Prynne* saith pag. 4. that *Let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican*, is interpreted by 1 *Cor.* 5. 10, 11, 12. 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. and elsewhere by *Paul*. Now that place of the *Corinthians* which he citeth, is meant of Excommunication, as shall be proved in due time. And vers. 12. (cited by himselfe) makes it plaine, that a judiciall act, not a private mans withdrawing onely, is meant; for that verse speaks twice of judging, an Apostolicall judging, and an Ecclesiasticall judging. And the best interpreters expound 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. of Church censures. Its not the case of

of private civill injuries which the Apostle there speaks of, but the case of publique scandall, *If any man be disobedient* to the Apostolicall Epistle, *note that man*, σημειῶσθε, put a marke upon him, that is, let him be publiquely censured, *Let him be separated from you*, saith the Syriak, and then *have no company with him*, and all this *that he may be ashamed*, which must needs be by some publique censure or blacke mark put upon him.

3. *Let him be to thee as an Heathen*; if it be meant of keeping no civil company, he must shew us that the Jews of old were and Christians under the new Testament are forbidden to keepe civill company with Heathens and those that are without the Church. He goeth about to prove that the phrase is taken from the practice of the Jewes in that age, pag. 4. But how doth he prove it? He citeth some places to prove that the *Israelites* might not marry with the *Canaanites*, but he doth not prove that they might not keep civill company with any of the Heathens. There was no such favour nor fellowship permitted between the *Israelites* and the *Canaanites*, as between the *Israelites* and other Gentiles who came among them from other Lands, as *Tostatus* noteth *in Matth. 26. quæst. 43.* The reason was because God had destinat the *Canaanites* to utter destruction, and that the whole Land of *Canaan* should be given to the children of *Israel*. Onely some few by speciall dispensation were spared as the *Gibeonites* because *Joshua* and the Princes had sworne unto them, and *Rahab* with her kindred because she saved the spies. But such extraordinary cases excepted, the *Israelites* ought not to permit any of the *Canaanites* to live, nor receive them though they had been willing to be circumcised as *Tostatus* there thinketh. However that great distance and alienation in point of fellowship between the *Israelites* and the *Canaanites*, was not *qua* Heathens, but *qua Canaanites*, otherwise the children of *Israel* had been obliged to root out other Nations as well as the *Canaanites*. Yea the Law puts an expresse difference between the Nations, in so much that some of them were not to be abominate, though others were, *Deut.* 23. 7. *Thou shalt not abhorre an Edomite, for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhorre an Egyptian, because thou wast a stranger in his Land.* The very *Canaanites* themselves were by the Law, *Deut.* 20. 10, 11. *Joshua* 11 20.

to have so much favour as an offer of peace, which if any of their Cities had accepted, that City was not to be cut off, but the people thereof were to be tributaries, and to serve *Israel*, and so permitted to live among them.

The last of his citations maketh very much against him, namely, *Acts* 21.28,29. where the Jewes of *Asia* doe accuse *Paul* for bringing Greekes into the Temple. *For they had seen before with him in the City Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the Temple.* Marke here *Paul* is not challenged for conversing familiarly with a Greeke, but onely for bringing him into the Temple; and without all doubt the malice of his adversaries did catch at every advantage which they could have against him. I cannot but admire how M. *Prynne* could cite this place to prove that the Jewes might not converse nor keepe civill company with the Heathens, since it proveth the very contrary, that the Jewes might have civill, but no religious fellowship with Heathens. And whereas he addeth that the Jewes had no dealing or conversation with the *Samaritans*, *Joh.* 4. 9. *Luke* 9. 52,53. I answer, the reason was because the Jewish Church had excommnnicated and anathematized for ever the *Samaritans*, who being once circumcised and having received the booke of the Law, did afterward hinder the building of the house of the Lord. This Excommunication of the *Cuthites* or *Samaritans* most solemnly performed you may finde in *Pirke R. Eccleſiæ, cap.* 38. More of this elsewhere. Here I onely touch it, to shew that this also of the *Samaritans* makes against him.

4. It is certaine that the Jewes had civill company and conversation with Heathens. For *Solomons* servants and *Hirams* servants were both together, 1 *Kings* 5.18. 2 *Chr.* 2.8. yea, 2 *Chr.* 2.17,18. *Solomon* numbred of strangers or heathens in the Land of *Israel*, a hundred fifty and three thousand and six hundred. Could there be so many of them and employed also in the building of the Temple, and yet no civill company kept with them? *Nehemiah* in the Court of *Artaxerxes*, and *Daniel* with his companions in the court of *Nebuchadnezzar* had civill company with Heathens, but religious company with them they would have none. We finde the King of *Edom* in fellowship with *Jehoshaphat*

hoshaphat and *Jehoram*, 2 *Kings* 3. And the Merchants of *Tyre* were permitted to come into *Jerusalem*, and there to sell all manner of ware unto the children of *Juda*, onely they were forbidden to doe it upon the Sabbath day, *Nehem.* 13.16,20,21. *L' Empereur de legibus Ebræorum forensibus pag.* 180,181. putteth it out of controversie, that in Christs time there were many Heathens in the Land of *Canaan* with whom the Jewes did converse and dwell together; and that Christ found in those places where he preached both Jewes and Gentiles. *Istis locis inter istos commorabantur Gentiles, qui magistrorum placitis se astringi passi non sunt.* And a little after, *Nec enim Israelitas ab alienigenarum urbibus abstinuisse, Josephus Indicat.* And that long before that time there was a mutuall conversing of Jewes and Gentiles, I gather from 1 *Kings* 20.34. *Thou shalt make streets for thee in Damascus as my father made in Samaria*, meaning for trade and commerce.

I will here anticipate a great objection which may be made against me, from *Acts* 10.28. *Ye know that it is an unlawfull thing for a man that is a Jew to keepe company or come unto one of another Nation.* This might seem to make more for Mr *Prynnes* exposition, then all the places cited by himselfe. But I answer, for the better understanding of that place, first of all observe what *Drusius Quæst. & resp. lib.*2. *quæst.* 67. tels us out of *Elias in Thesbite:* The Jewes had an old law against drinking Wine with Gentiles or Heathens, *Lata videlicet eo tempore quo gentes vinum libabant in sacris*, the Law was made at that time when the Gentiles used a prælibation of Wine in their idolatrous solemnities: whereupon the wise men of the Jewes fearing lest Heathen men should give to Jewes that Wine which had been dedicated to Idols did forbid the Jewes to drinke Wine with Heathens: which (as other Statutes of their wise men) the Jewes did *religiosè* religiously observe. Marke we hence, 1. It was not a generall received custome among the Jewes, in no case to eate or drinke with Heathens; else it had been unnecessary and supervacaneous to forbid the drinking of Wine with Heathens, *exceptio affirmat regulam in non exceptis.* 2. It was for a religious and consciencious reason, *propter periculum idololatriæ*, for feare of pertaking with Idolatry, and not for

civill respects, that they were forbidden to drinke Wine with the Gentiles. The same I say of their shunning to eate with them, for the Heathens used also a dedicating of their meats to Idols, 1 *Cor.*10.27.

Secondly, observe *Peter* addeth immediately: *but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or uncleane:* meaning, so as not to keepe company with him because of his Gentilisme or uncircumcision, or because of his eating of meats which were uncleane by the ceremoniall Law, as *Ludovicus de Dieu* doth rightly give the meaning, understanding, not morall, but onely ceremoniall uncleanesse to be there spoken of; for many men under the Gospell are still to be looked upon and avoyded as morally uncleane. But God had taught *Peter* by abrogating the ceremoniall differences of meats in the vision, that the ceremoniall Law which was the partition wall between Jewes and Gentiles, was now to be taken away: so that the Gentiles should be no longer called *dogs*, as *Matth.* 15.26. neither were the Disciples to be forbidden any longer to goe into the way of the Gentiles, *Matth.*10.5. Henceforth no man should be called holy because of his circumcision, no man uncleane because of his uncircumcision.

This being the meaning, it followeth that the unlawfulnesse of eating and companying with an Heathen mentioned Act. 10. 28. must not be so understood, as if bare civill fellowship had been unlawfull; but it must be understood, first, in reference to the morall Law, that is for avoiding the danger of Idolatry in eating or drinking that which Idolatrous Heathens had sacrificed to Idolls, as hath been just now cleared. Secondly, in reference to the Ceremoniall Law, or of such fellowship as was contrary to the ceremoniall Law, in eating together with Heathens of meats legally unclean, such as were represented to *Peter* in the vision, and he commanded to eate what was formerly unclean to him. Otherwise when the Gentiles did not eat any thing which the Jewes were forbidden to eat, it was lawfull for the Jewes to eat with the Gentiles saith *Tostatus in 2. Paral. 6. Quest.* 21. So likewise *Grotius de Iure Belli ac pacis lib.* 2. cap. 15. Sect. 9. where he referreth the Jewes their not eating with the Heathens, to the Law of meats or the *peculiaris*

liaris victus which was prescribed to the Jewes. But otherwise the Law did not make it unlawfull for them to eat with any of another Nation: which he thinks is proved by Christs own example who took a drink of water from the woman of *Samaria*, being yet most observant of the Law. That the unlawfulnesse of eating with the Heathens was understood in reference to the ceremoniall Law, I prove, from *Gal.* 2. 12. 14. *Peter* having before eaten with the Gentiles, to avoid the scandall of some Jewes that came from *James*, did withdraw and separate himself from the believing Gentiles: What? to keep no more any civill company with them. I hope no man will imagine that. But the Text expounds it selfe *vers.* 14. *If thou being a Iew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as doe the Iewes, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as doe the Jewes?* This was *Peters* fault, that having formerly lived as the Gentiles, that is, eating with them all sorts of meats freely, thinking himself liberate from the Yoke of the ceremoniall Law, afterward he withdrew and separated himself from that manner of fellowship with the Gentiles, and bound up himselfe to live as doe the Jewes, and to observe the distinction of meats according to the Law. And in so doing, whiles he avoided the scandall of the Jewes, he gave a greater scandall to the Gentiles in compelling them by the authority of his example to Judaize, and to thinke the ceremoniall Law necessary.

Thirdly, The foresaid place *Act.* 10. is to be understood of such fellowship as was not meerely civill, but religious and sacred: as may appear, 1. by the exposition formerly given of these words, *God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.* 2. by the invitation of the men that were sent from *Cornelius* to *Peter* who did not call him to civill but to sacred fellowship *Act.* 10. 22. *And they said,* Cornelius *the Centurion, a just man and one that feareth God, and of good report among all the Nation of the Jewes, was warned from God by an holy Angell, to send for thee into his house and to heare words of thee.* 3. *Peter* calls in the men and lodgeth them; that being a civill fellowship, he doth it freely, *v.* 23: but when he comes to *Cornelius* and those that were assembled with him, to heare words from *Peter*, here was the case of conscience, and here *Peter* beginneth to apolo-

gize *v.* 28. *ye knew how that it is an unlawfull thing, &c.* The Syriak hath it thus, *ye know that it is not lawfull for a man that is a Jew to joyn himſelf unto a man that is a ſtranger, who is not a ſonne of his generation:* as it were intimating a religious and Church fellowſhip. 4. That which gave offence to them of the circumciſion at *Ieruſalem*, was, that they heard *Peter* had ſo gone in to men uncircumciſed, that they had alſo received the word of God from him *Act.* 11. 1. 3. And as ſoone as they were ſatisfied in that point, that God had given unto the Gentiles repentance unto life *verſ.* 18. they held their Peace, and made no further ſcruple concerning eating with them.

I hope I have ſufficiently anſwered the ſtrongeſt objection which can be made againſt that which I did begin to prove, namely, that the Jewes might and did keep civill company and fellowſhip with Heathens. Which that I may now further confirme, let it be obſerved with *Schindlerus in lexic. pentaglo p.* 297. that there were two ſorts of Proſelytes among the Jewes. Some that were circumciſed and received the Law of *Moſes*; and ſuch a one was even as a Jew, and was called *Proſelytus juſtitiæ* or *fœderis*, a righteous or a true Proſelyte, or a Proſelyte of the Covenant. Others, that did onely renounce Idolatry and keep the ſeven precepts given to the ſonnes of *Noah*, not being circumciſed nor keeping the Law of *Moſes*, were permitted to dwell with the Jewes, and therefore ſuch a one was called *Proſelytus portæ* or *Proſelytus incola*, a Proſelyte of the Gate, or a Proſelyte indweller, who dwelt within their Gates. See for the ſame thing *L' Empereur de legibus Ebræorum forenſibus* pag. 72 *Buxtorf lexic. Rabbin.* p. 408. 409. *Grotius de Iure belli ac pacis lib.* 1. *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 16. *Henr. Vorſtius obſerv. ad chronol. R. Ganz.* pag. 279. *Georgius Genzius in annot. ad Maimon. canon. Ethic.* p. 91. 92. To the ſame purpoſe, Maſter *Ainſworth annot. in Gen.* 9. 4. and on *Exod.* 12. 45. and on *Levit.* 22. 10. hath noted out of the Hebrew writers: that ſuch of the Heathens as did obſerve the ſeven precepts given to the Sonnes of *Noah*, though they were not circumciſed, neither did obſerve the Ordinances of the ceremoniall Law, nor were admitted to the holy things of the Children of Iſrael, yet they were permitted to cohabit and converſe with the people of God in the holy Land. And

that

that it was so, may be proved from *Levit.* 25. 6. 45. 47. (where the Chaldee hath *an uncireumcised* indweller) *Deut.* 14. 21. yea, such a one might dwell in the Priests house *Lev.* 22. 10. The Jewes receive no Proselyte now except one that undertakes to keep the whole Law to the least jote, as Doctor *Buxtorf* informes us in the place last cited: and so they are a great deale more strict in reference to the Gentiles then the Antient Jewes were. Notwithstanding they doe without scruple familiarly converse and keep company with Gentiles who keep not the last of the seven precepts which bind (as they think) all the Sonnes of *Noah*, namely that concerning the not eating of blood. How much more may we suppose that the Antient Jewes did keep civill company and fellowship with such Gentiles as did observe all these seven precepts? And this comparison the Jewes have made between themselves and the Gentiles in reference to the Law of *Moses*. *It is our inheritance, not theirs: as for them, let them observe the seven precepts. Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin.* cap. 7. Sect. 6. So that the Jewes were not scandalized at the Gentiles their not observing of the whole Law of *Moses*, not being circumcised, &c. but at their not keeping of those seven precepts, which were also a part of the Law of *Moses*. This to me appeareth to be a chief reason (if not the reason) why the Synod of the Apostles & Elders at *Ierusa.* did impose upon the Churches of the Gentiles no other burthen of Jewish rites & Ceremonies, but to abstain from blood & things strangled: they did not impose circumcision, nor holy dayes, nor the like: because that which was intended was, to draw together the beleevers of the Jewes & the beleevers of the Gentiles into a familiar conversation, that they might live together and eat together without scandall: and this could not be, except the beleiving Gentiles should observe the seven precepts which were given not onely to the posterity of *Abraham*, but to the posterity of *Noah*; of which precepts one did forbid the eating of blood *Gen.* 9. 4. (and under that is comprehended also the eating of things strangled) Now there was no doubt of the beleiving Gentiles their observing of the other six precepts which the Hebrewes say were observed from *Adam* to *Noah*: the first against Idolatry, 2. against blasphemy, 3. against shedding of blood, 4. against uncleanesse or unlawfull copulations,

5. against

5. against Rapine or Robbery, 6. for executing judgement and inflicting punishment upon malefactors. All the question was of the seventh and last against eating of blood, which the beleiving Gentiles (though they knew it to be older then the ceremoniall Law or circumcision it self, and to belong to all the posterity of *Noah*, yet) knew to be temporary and not perpetuall, and so at the abrogation of the other ceremonies, and propagation of the Gospell to the Gentiles, thought themselves free from that, as well as other Ceremonies. On the other part,
// it was a principle among the Jewes, that they ought not to
// converse familiarly with any of the Gentiles, except such as observe the seven precepts given to the Sonnes of *Noah*. Wherefore the Synod of the Apostles and Elders thought good that the beleiving Gentiles should so farre condescend to the weakness of the Jewes (not fully instructed concerning Christian liberty, and the abrogation of the old ceremonies) as to observe for a time that precept against eating blood, as well as the other precepts given to the Sonnes of *Noah*; to the intent that the Jewes and Gentiles might Peaceably and familiarly cohabite and converse together: for though the Gentiles did not observe the other ordinances and ceremonies of the Jewes: yet observing those seven precepts, they were free to converse familiarly with the Jewes. *Schindlerus* in his *Lexicon pentagl.* pag. 298. and pag. 1530 seemeth to have had the same notion; for he saith the Apostles and Elders would not impose circumcision and the keeping of the Law of *Moses*, but they imposed some things not unlike to the precepts given to the Sonnes of *Noah*. I returne to that distinction of the two sorts of Proselytes. The one had the name of *Ger tzedek* a Proselyte of righteousnesse, and *Ger berith*, a Proselyte of the Covenant. The other was called *Ger toschav*, a Proselyte indweller and *Ger schagnar*, a Proselyte of the Gate, *qui intra portas, inter Judæos scilicet habitabat, who dwelt within the Gates, to wit among the Iewes* saith *Matthias Martinius in Lexic. philol.* pag. 2922. This Proselyte indweller was
// not called nor esteemed as one of the Jewes, being no Church
Member, nor admitted to any religious or Church Commnnion with the Jewes, but he was still esteemed and reckoned as one of the uncircumcised Gentiles. Yet the Iewes did keep civill company

company and fellowship with such a one, as with a neighbour and a inhabitant of the same City, or Land.

And if the Jewes had not been free to keep civill company with Heathens or Infidells, yet Christians are expressely allowed to do so. 1 *Cor.* 10. 27. *If any of them that beleeve not, bid you to a Feast, and ye be disposed to go, whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake*; and *Ch.* 5.10.11.12. the Apostle permitteth Christians to company and eat with Fornicators, Covetous, Extortioners, or Idolaters, who are no Church-Members, but by no meanes with scandalous Brethren. I doe not dispute whether any more liberty of this kind is granted to Christians, then peradventure was granted to the Jewes. Yet I am sure a great measure of the liberty of civill fellowship with Heathens was granted to the Jewes also.

It must needs follow from that which hath been said, that, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, is not a casting out from mere civill fellowship and company, but from religious and Church-fellowship. This agreeth well with that passage in *Josephus contra Appionem lib.* 2. *Whoever* (of the Gentiles) *are willing to come and live under our Law, it doth freely receive them esteeming Communion to consist not onely in origination or descent, but also in choyce of life. But as for those* (of the Gentiles) *who come occasionally among us, our Law doth not admit them into our solemne or sacred Assemblies, but it appointeth to communicate unto them all such things as they need, as fire, water, meat, also to shew them the way, and to let none of them be unburied.* (So likewise Publicans noted for impiety and injustice were permitted to be City Members, but not owned for Church-Members) *Grotius de Jure Belli ac pacis lib.* 2. c. 15. Sect. 9. holds that it was lawfull for the Jewes, not onely to have company and commerce with Heathens, but to doe them good and to enter in League and Covenant with them, such onely excepted as the Law did accurse, namely the seven Nations in *Canaan*, the *Amalekites*, *Ammonites* and *Moabites*. He brings among other things the example of the *Asmonites*, who as they were themselves skilled in the Law, so with the approbation both of Priests and People, they made a Covenant with the *Lacedemonians* and *Romanes*: yea publikely prayed for them. Learned

Master *Selden de Iure nat. & Gent. lib.* 2. c. 3 doth not onely confirme what hath been said before of the *Proselyti Domicilii*, Heathens not circumcised nor keeping the Law of *Moses*, but observing the seven precepts given to the Sonnes of *Noah*, and that such were permitted to dwell together with the Children of Israel; but he further tells us out of *Maimonides* that though when the Jewish Republike did flourish and when they were *sui Iuris*, no strangers were permitted to dwell among them except such as did renounce Idolatry and keep the seven precepts, yet after the captivity and under the Romans, the Jewes did allow to themselves a common commerce and civill conversing even with such Gentiles, as had not renounced the Pagan or Idolatrous worship; & as for such of the Gentiles, as the Jewes did observe to be good men whom they called *ex piis è Gentibus mundi*, such as *Cornelius* the Centurion, to whom the Jewes themselves gave a good testimony of these he saith that though they were not formally admitted and received as Proselyte indwellers were wont to be (that formall reception of *Proselyti Domicilii* having ceased in those later times) yet he puts it out of doubt that the Jewes were willing that such Gentiles should dwell among them.

Adde hereunto that which *Gul. Vorstius annot. in Maimon. de fundam. legis cap.* 5. *Sect.* 9. observeth out of *Beth Joseph de Idolat.* and out of *abodâ zarâ*, that a Heathen man was permitted to be Phisitian to a Jew, provided that he should not entice him to Idolatry: and that a Jew also was permitted to be Physitian to a Gentile, for which purpose they alledged the example of *Moses* who (as their Tradition told them) did practice medicine in *Egypt*.

Furthermore when Master *Prynne* understands nothing by those words *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, but avoid civill fellowship and keep no familiar company with him, and expounds it also by 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *with such a one not to eat* (which he still conceives to be onely meant of avoiding civill fellowship) and by 2. *Jo.* 10. *receive him not into thy house*. He is twice out, both because the Jewes did keep civill company with Heathens which hath been proved: and also because (if we beleive the Jewish writters concerning the customes of their Nation)

Nation) the Rabbies or wise men among them did not keep familiar fellowship nor civill company with the Plebeians of the Jewes themselves: they were forbidden to eat and drink with or among the Plebeians. *Maimen de fundam. legis* cap. 5. Sect. 13. neither might they converse in the paths nor come into the houses of the Plebeians. *Ibid. Sect.* 14. *Gul. Vorstius* in his *annot. pag.* 73. addeth a passage in *Misna* that a wise man might neither lodge with a Plebeian nor receive a Plebeian to lodge with him. Nevertheless a wise man was permitted to converse not onely civilly but frequently with an Heathen man, for which see Master *Selden de Iure nat. & Gent. lib.* 6. cap. 10. *quoniam nihil mali ex Gentilium consuetudine viro scientiori imminere censebant.* So that in Master *Prynnes* sence, all the Plebeians of the Jewes themselves were as Heathens and Publicans, or civilly excommunicated by their wise men.

Wherefore we must needs distinguish a two fold communion or fellowship among the Jewes, one civill, another Ecclesiasticall; It was the shutting out from the Ecclesiasticall communion of the Jewes, which Christ alludes to *Mat.* 18. for beside the distinct notions of the Jewish Church and the Jew State (of which before) *Is. Abrabanel de capite fidei* cap. 6. speaking of certaine fundamentall Articles which the Jewish Church did beleive, saith, they were intended to be *Articles of Iudaisme, so that he that should beleive these should be in the communion of Israel:* and *Ib. cap.* 3. speaking of an Article concerning the coming of the Messiah, he moves a doubt about it, because *Rabbi Hillell* who denieth it, was not *excluded from the communion of the Law*, for the *Gemara* gives him the Title of *Rabbi.* When he comes to the solution of this doubt *cap.* 14. he cleares *Rabbi Hillell*, as not denying that Article. But all this intimateth that for heresy there was a shutting out from Ecclesiasticall communion: Or that an hereticall apostat Jew was unto them as an Heathen man; and therefore they were permitted to take usury as from strangers or Heathens, so from an apostat Jew, *quia fratris nomen exuerat* saith Master *Selden de Iure nat. & Gent. lib.* 6 *c.* 10. In *Tzemach David edit. Hen. Vorst.* pag. 67. it is said that the chief of the Hereticks were *Tzadok* and *Baythos*, who denying rewards and punishments

after this life, *exiverunt e communione (vel cœtu Israelis)* they went out from the Ecclesiasticall communion of *Israel*.

This is good reason to say of a sonne of Israel, if he be a sonne of Belial, let him be to thee as an Heathen, that is, esteeme him as prophane, and as lost as an Heathen: have no more Church communion with him then with an Heathen. And by this time I suppose it doth fully appeare to the intelligent Reader that some uncircumcised Heathens were admitted in to the civill fellowship, and some Israelites continued not in the Ecclesiasticall fellowship of the Jewes: which overturneth the whole strength of Mr *Prynnes* answer to our argument from *Matth.* 18 But once more, (for I have thought good to insist the longer upon this point, because much dependeth upon it.) *Let him be to thee as an Heathen*, doth forbid Ecclesiasticall communion, not civill company except secondarily & as a consequent of Excommunication, & for spirituall respects and ends (as I shall shew anon) but it is not meant of abstaining from meere civil company & fellowship: because the Jews were permitted to keep civil company and fellowship with Heathens, even any civill company which did not encroach upon Religion, or had appearance of an ensnarement into Idolatry, and in that respect (as participating of Religious fellowship) became unlawfull. This is the point I have been proving, and which I will yet further prove out of *Maimonides de Idolatria cap 9.* That one Chapter is sufficient to decide the present question Thus it begins. *Three daies before the feasts (or holydaies) of Heathens that worship Idols, we are forbidden to buy from them, or to sell unto them any durable thing; to take or give any thing in lend; to take or make payment of that which was given in lend upon writ, or pledge; but what was given in lend upon words onely, it is lawfull to exact; because this seemeth to be taken out of their hands. It is also lawfull to sell unto them, that which can not last, as green herbs or any thing sodden; and that ever until their holy day.* You see it was lawfull among the Jewes to buy and sell, borrow and lend, to make contracts, with Heathens, yea with Idolatrous Heathens; onely in some (not in all) things there was a restraint upon them, and that but three daies before the Heathen festivities. Then follows *Sect. 2. This hath place in the land of the Israelites: but in the*

others

other lands, it is not forbidden except upon their holy day. If any man transgresse, by having trade or commerce with them, during that space of three daies, it is lawfull (though) to use the ware: but if any man trade with them upon their holyday, the things are forbidden to be used. It is unlawfull also to send a gift to an Heathen man upon his holy day: unlesse it be known that he doth not professe the worship of Idols, neither serveth them. But if some Heathen man upon his Holyday send a gift to an Israelite, let him not take it from him, unlesse it be suspected that he will be offended. Nevertheless he shall not use it, untill it be known that the Heathen man doth not worship Idols nor esteem them to be Gods. Observe 1. that the things mentioned in the first Section, though unlawfull to the Jewes in their own Land, three daies before the Heathenish festivities, yet they held them not unlawfull in other Lands. 2. They held it lawfll for a Jew to send a gift to an Heathen man, or to receive a gift from him, so that it were not upon the Heathenish festivity. 3. Yea in some cases it was permitted to a Jew to send a gift to an Heathen man, upon the very Heathen festivity, (to wit, if he knew that Heathen man to be no worshipper of Idols) as likewise to receive a gift from him (though upon the holy day) for avoyding of offence.

Sect. 4. reckoneth among the Heathenish festivities a day set apart by them for coronation of a King, or in memory of a mans nativity, deliverance out of danger, or the like. Then it is added *Sect.* 5. *But with those Idolaters who spend that day in mirth and gladnesse, eating and drinking, and observe that day whether for custome or for the Kings honour, nevertheless hold it not for a holy day, it is lawfull to have commerce and trade.* When conversing with Heathens did not entrench upon Religion, they could doe it without scruple, even upon the Heathens good daies or solemnities of joy. Then *Sect.* 8. *If Israelites dwell among Heathens with whom they have made a Covenant, it is lawfull to sell armes to the Kings servants and to his military forces, &c. It is unlawfull to enter into a Town in which Idolatry is practiced: it is lawfull to come out of it. But if the Idoll be without the Town, it is also lawfull to enter in it.* If the Jewes might dwell among and enter into league and covenant with Heathens, yea enter into the Townes of Idolaters, when the Idoll was not in Town,

Town, then they held it not unlawfull to have any civill company with Heathens. It follows *Sect.*11. *It is lawfull to goe to the markets or faires of Heathens, and to buy from them beasts, men-servants, maid-servants, though they be yet Heathens: also houses, fields, vineyards. Also for writing (contracts) it is permitted to goe to their judiciall courts.*

If it be objected that *Sect.*12. doth forbid an Israelite to come to the banquet of a Heathen, which he hath made for his sonne or for his daughter; I answer from that very place. For lest this should be taken for a prohibition of civill fellowship, *Maimonides* did adde these words. *Now this intervall is appointed for Idolatry: for it is said, and one call thee, and thou eate of his Sacrifice, and thou take of their daughters unto thy sonnes, and they goe a whoring after their Gods:* citing *Exod.*34.15,16.

From all which I conclude, that Christs words, relating to the Jewish custome, *Let him be to thee as a Heathen man*, cannot be meant (as Mr *Prynne* would have them) of avoyding meere civill company and fellowship; for as much as it was not held unlawfull among the Jewes to have civill company and commerce with Heathens. Sure the Jewes of our age are farre from holding such a thing unlawfull.

Yea so farre I am unsatisfied with Mr *Prynnes* interpretation, that I verily believe (and so doe some others) a part of the intendment of these words, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, is to hold forth the lawfulnesse, yea the obligation of performing all naturall (and in diverse cases morall) duties to a person Excommunicated: I meane that the Text doth intimate thus much. As upon the one hand the contumacious offender who will not heare the Church, is to be used no better than an Heathen or a prophane Publican, and is not to be admitted to any Ordinance, except such as Heathens and prophane Publicans are and may be admitted unto; So upon the other hand, let him have no worse usage and entertainment, then those very Heathens and Publicans, unto whom all naturall and some morall duties are performed, notwithstanding they be Heathens and Publicans. For the Apostle commandeth Christians to be subject even to Heathen Magistrates, servants to honour and be subject to heathen and ungodly Masters,

Maſters, the wife not to depart from the husband becauſe he believeth not. So that this rule of Chriſt, *Matth.* 18. 17. is ſo full and perfect, as to teach us, as well what fellowſhip is lawfull with ſuch a one, as what fellowſhip is not lawfull to be kept with him. I doe not deny but that (according to the ordinary rule) fellowſhip with an excommunicate perſon in meat, drinke, familiarity, and ſalutations, is unlawfull, as well as in the Sacrament and prayer, according to the received rule:

Si pro delictis, anathema quis efficiatur;
Os, orare, vale, communio, menſa negatur.

And the Scripture forbidding to eate with ſuch a one, or to have company with him, or to bid him God ſpeed, will reach as farre. Nevertheleſſe there are divers excepted or reſerved caſes in which the performance of naturall duties unto and keeping of civill company with an excommunicate perſon is allowed. The exception made from the rule is this:

Hæc anathema quidem faciunt, ne poſſit obeſſe:
Utile, lex, humile, res ignorata, neceſſe.

Utile, as when a man ſeeketh payment of debt from an excommunicate perſon. *Lex*, becauſe the law alloweth husband and wife to company together, though the one of them be excommunicate. *Humile*, becauſe children may and ought to doe the duties of children, and ſervants the duty of ſervants, and ſubjects the duty of ſubjects, and vaſſals the duty of vaſſals, and ſouldiers the duty of ſouldiers, in companying with ſubmitting unto, honouring and obeying of their excommunicated Parents, Maſters, Kings, Lords, Commanders. *Res ignorata*, when he that companieth with an excommunicate perſon, doth not know that he is excommunicate. *Neceſſe*, as when a man paſſeth through the Land or is under the power of excommunicate perſons, or ſome ſuch way is drawn into a neceſſity of ſpeaking and companying with them. All which is moſt agreeable to this expreſſion, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, and to the nature of Excommunication, which doth not breake aſunder naturall or morall, but ſpirituall and eccleſiaſticall bonds. If it be asked why then are we forbidden to eate with an excommunicate perſon, or to bid him God

ſpeed;

speed; I answer, these things are not forbidden but under a spirituall notion and for a spirituall end, that the offender may be ashamed and humbled, that others may not be deceived by countenancing of him or companying with him, and that our eating with him or saluting of him may not be interpreted as a conniving at, or complying with his sinnes, or as a signe of Christian fellowship with a scandalous person formerly called a brother; finally that God may be the more glorified, wickedness the more ashamed, others the more edified, the sinner the more abased, our selves the better kept from snares by avoyding of all appearance of evill. Otherwise setting aside these and such like spirituall considerations and respects, I doe aver that Excommunication hath nothing to doe with the avoyding of civill company *qua* civill, that is under a civill or politicall notion.

Thus we have the negative part of the rule of Christ. Now to the positive part. What is it to be *as an Heathen and a Publican?* He must not be worse used in naturall or civill things, yet he must be used in the same manner as an Heathen and a Publican, in spirituall things.

Wherefore, *Let him be as an Heathen man*, implieth foure things:

1. I have proved that Heathens were not permitted to come into the utter Court of the Temple, which the children of *Israel* did come into, onely they might come and worship in the *Intermurale* or *atrium Gentium*; and when they were at any time brought into the Temple, its challenged both by God, *Ezek.* 44.7,9. and by the people of the Jews, *Acts* 21.28.

2. Heathens, though sojourning among the children of Israel, and dwelling within their gates might not eate of the Passeover *Exod.* 12.43,45. where the civill fellowship was allowed, partaking of the Passeover was forbidden.

3. No Heathen man, no not he that was in the Priests house, might eate of an offering of the holy things, *Levit.* 22.10,13.

4. A Sacrifice was not accepted from the hand of an Heathen *Levit.* 22.25. those that came from a farre Countrey to pray and worship before the Temple, if they had brought out of their owne Country, or had bought in the Land of *Israel*, Beasts,

beasts, or Bread, or Oyle, or Frankincence, or the like, and brought any of these for an Oblation, it was not accepted from their hand as *Tostatus in 2. paral. 6. quest.21.* rightly observeth. Onely he collecteth from *Ezra 6.8,10.* that an Heathen might give to the Priests money or expences to buy Sacrifices, and to offer them in the Temple.

Fiftly, and generally, the Heathens had no part or portion with Gods people, *Nehem.2.20.* they were not within but without the Church, *being aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world, Ephes.2.12.* So that, *Let him be as an Heathen* must reach thus farre, Let him no more partake in the Ordinances then an Heathen, have no more Church-communion with him then with an Heathen, let him be no more acknowledged for a Church member than an Heathen. And good reason; he hath made himselfe as an Heathen, yea worse than an Heathen, *Rom.2.25. If thou be a breaker of the Law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.* Yea a scandalous and prophane Church member is *worse then an Infidell, 1 Tim.5.8. 1 Cor.5.1.*

This fivefold restraint of Heathens from the Temple, from the Passeover, from eating of an Offering, from bringing an Oblation unto the Lord, and generally from all Church fellowship, did lie even upon those Heathens who did cohabit and familiarly converse with the children of *Israel*, who are called *proselyti domicilii:* and no Heathen man was free of such restraint, except *proselyti justitiæ*, who were circumcised and made members of the Jewish Church, and had the name of Jewes.

Finally, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man*, may have a Commentary from *1 Sam.26.19.* where *David* curseth his enemies before the Lord, because they had made him as an Heathen man: *they have driven me out this day from abiding in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Goe serve other Gods.* He did not reckon his banishment, want of civill liberties, cutting off from the civill fellowship and company of the children of *Israel*, in comparison of that which was farre worse to him, and a great deale heavier to be borne, namely, that he was rejected and repudiate

pudiate from spirituall fellowship with Gods people, from partaking in the holy Ordinances, from comming to the Sanctuary, from the Church priviledges, that his persecution was materially and substantially an Excommunication, and *qua* Excommunication *it* was more grievous to him then *qua* persecution.

I suppose it now appeares that *Let him be to thee as an Heathen man*, is a shutting out not from civill, but from sacred fellowship. The other branch, *Let him be to thee as a Publican*, I have before said enough of it. This onely I adde. There were among the Jewes two sorts of Publicans: some were good and just men, exacting no more then what was appointed them; others were unjust and extortioners, and thereby made infamous. The former sort the Hebrews have professed they were willing to converse civilly withall, as members of the same Commonwealth. See *L' Empereur de legibus Ebræorum forensibus*, pag. 272. But when Christ saith, *Let him be to thee as a Publican*, he means the impious and unjust Publican onely, as the same learned Antiquary there saith. And so when our Saviour bids us esteem such a one not onely as an Heathen man, but as a Publican, he means that he is not only to be denied fellowship in the holy things, but further made infamous among the people; for the name *Publican* is used to signifie the worst of men, *Matth.* 5. 46, 47. and in the Gospell it is said, *Publicans and Sinners, Publicans and Harlots*, as was noted before. So *Hierome* upon *Matth.* 18. 17. understands the name of Publicans *secundum Tropologiam*, for such as are given to unlawfull gaines, deceits, thefts, perjuries, and such like abominable wickednesses. Wherefore we must not thinke that for civill respects of Tax-gathering or the like the Jewes refused to keepe civill company or fellowship with the Publicans. For we read in *Exc. Gem. Sanhedrin cap.* 3. *sect.* 3. that though he that was a shepheard, as such, was unfit to be a witnesse, yet he that was simply a Publican (that is, as *J. Coch.* saith in his Annotation, a Publican who is not convict of exacting more then is appointed by Law) or a Publican as a Publican is not forbidden to be witnesse. Where it is also added, that the father of *R. Sira* had the office of a Publican thirteen yeeres. Hence we see that a Publican,

lican were he a Jew or Gentile, provided he were a juſt Publican, his teſtimony had faith and credit in Judgement; How then can it be ſuppoſed that the Jewes did not ſo much as keep any civill company with ſuch a one? We muſt therefore underſtand that the Jewes refuſed to have any fellowſhip with the impious and unjuſt Publicans, as with Church members, and this the Jewes did becauſe of their ſcandalous ungodlineſſe and unrighteouſneſſe.

Wherefore to be eſteemed as a Publican was eſteemed among the Jewes, comprehendeth theſe three things. 1. To be eſteemed as the worſt of men, impious, abominable, execrable, infamous, and as it were *publici odii victimæ*, for ſo were the Publicans eſteemed among the Jewes. Dr *Buxtorf. lexic. Chald. Talm. & Rabbin. pag.* 1065. tels us that where in *Sanhedrin fol.* 44. 2. it is ſaid *of a certaine Publican*, the Gloſſe expounds it thus, *Of a certaine wicked man.* 2. Not to hold or keep with ſuch a one, the religious Chriſtian fellowſhip, which we keep with Church members; yea, and (for religious ends, and in ſpirituall reſpects, as was ſaid before) not to keep with ſuch a one, ſo much as that civill fellowſhip which we are permitted to keep with Pagans and unbelievers, with whom when bidden to a feaſt, we may goe and eate together as the Apoſtle expreſly reſolveth, but with him that is called a brother when ſcandalous and obſtinate, (and therefore juſtly made as a Publican) we may not ſo much as eate, as the ſame Apoſtle teacheth, wherein thoſe are ever to be excepted, who are tied by naturall relations to performe naturall and humane duties to the party excommunicate and made as a Publican, as the wife to the husband, the children to their parents.

In both theſe reſpects, Let him be as a Publican, ſuperaddeth ſomewhat, and ſaith more then was in that other part, Let him be as an Heathen man. The third thing which I conceive to be meant by being eſteemedas a Publican, is coincident with was meant by *Let him be as an Heathen*, that is, let him be kept that which back from communion and fellowſhip with the Church in the holy things. Mr *Prynne* brought a parabolicall argument concerning the Publicans going up to the Temple to pray. That devout and religious Publicans, whether Jewes or Gentiles

did goe up into the Temple to pray, I make no question, and such a one is the Publican in the Parable; yea, if we marke the Pharisees owne words he speaketh of that Publican as one of the best and most religious Publicans *Luk.* 18. 11. *God, I thanke thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners unjust, adulterers,* ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης *or even as this Publican,* The vulgar Latin hath it *velut etiam hic publicanus, as likewise this Publican,* making the publican to be one of those extortioners, unjust, adulterers. But it is a mistake of the Text, which plainly holds forth a disjunctive, not a copulative sence. The Pharisee is further declaring what himself was not, and the disjunctive ἢ intimateth some new matter. Therefore the Syriak and Arabik hath it, *neither as this publican. Erasmus, aut etiam ut hic publicanus. Arias Monntanus, aut & ut hic publicanus.* and the English, *or even as this publican.* Many of the publicans were extortioners, unjust, adulterers, but the Pharisee thought he had not said enough when he had preferred himself to these, therefore he addeth this ἐπίτασις, *or even as this publican,* which is a rising and heightning of his speech, as if he had said, *God, I thank thee that I am more holy and righteous then the best of the publicans, who yet are not (as most of them are) extortioners, unjust, adulterers.* But that prophane, unjust, scandalous, infamous, publicans whether Jewes or Gentiles, were allowed or permitted to come to the Temple, to the Worship, Prayer and Sacrifices, among the rest of the people of the Jewes, I deny it, and Master *Prynne* hath said nothing to prove it. These onely are the publicans meant of when Christ saith, *let him be unto thee as a publican.* Now this sort of publicans, if they were allowed any thing in reference to the Temple, it was but to stand afarre off in the *Intermurale* or *atrium Gentium* as Heathens might doe. If the religious publican stood afarre off, how much more the prophane infamous publican? That such as were publikely scandalous, infamous for impiety, and esteemed the worst of men (which I have shewed to be meant by *let him be unto thee as a publican*) were admitted into the Temple as much as the rest of the people of the Jewes, or had fellowship with the Church in the holy things, I doe not beleive, I have proved the contrary from *Philo* and *Josephus.*

CHAP. IV

CHAP. IV.

A confutation of Erastus *and* Bilson *their Interpretation of* Math. 18. 15, 16, 17. *as likewise of Doctor* Sutliffe *his Glosse differing some what from theirs.*

AS for that other Erastian Glosse upon *Matth.* 18. 17. that Christ meaneth of going to the orthodox Magistrate being of the same true religion, (&that this is the sence of those words *Tell the Church*) but if the Brother who hath done us wrong will not heare nor obey that Magistrate, then *let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a publican*, that is, thou mayest prosecute him, as thou wouldest prosecute an Heathen man or a Publican before an extrinsecall Tribunall, such as at that time the Roman Emperours was to the Jewes. See *Erastus thes.* 41. wherein he is followed by Bishop *Bilson of the perpetuall Government of Christs Church* cap. 4. This Glosse hath been justly rejected by many learned men. The first Argument which I bring against it, is that it is wide from the scope of the Text, yea prejudgeth and even overthroweth the great thing which is principally intended by Jesus Christ in this place, *Camero Myroth. in Math.* 18. thinks it is, utterly different from Christs intention in this place, which is to prescribe rules to our consciences concerning the amendment of our Brother, and the reducing of him from his sinne, not to give œconomicall rules concerning the reparation of our injuries or losses: Wherefore he concludes that by the Church is meant the Presbytery mentioned 1. *Tim.* 4. 14. He holdeth also that in the new Testa. the word ἐκκλησία doth ever signifie an Assembly *cum σχέσει ad religionem*, with an habitude and reference to religion. Let it be also observed with *Bucerus Script. Anglic.* pag. 40. 41. 304, 305, 306. that what our Saviour directeth one Brother to doe toward the gaining of another, by admonitions and reproofs, doth onely belong to the care and sollicitude of the salvation of his soule, and the gaining of him from eternall death to eternall life; and this he

collects from these words in the Text, *thy Brother*, and *thou hast gained thy Brother*. He doth also paralell *Math.* 18. 15. with *Gal.* 6. 1. *Brethren, if any man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spirituall, restore such an one in the spirit of meekenesse.* Now this as it is the surest exposition (expounding Scripture by Scripture) so it doth not concerne a Judiciall proceeding in the case of private Injuries, but the Christian duty of reclaiming and saving the soule from sin.

He further observeth that the thing which Christ recommendeth to every Christian, to be done *ex Charitate Christiana*, is nothing else but what is incumbent to Pastors *ex officio*; for Pastors ought by vertue of their publike charge and ministery to doe the same thing authoritatively, which one Christian is bidden doe to another in Christian Brotherly charity, that is to admonish, rebuke, &c.

I am perswaded were the Lord Jesus his scope and intent in this Text rightly understood, there should need no other confutation of the Glosses given either by *Erastus* or by Mr. *Prynne*. They restrict to the case of private or personall injuries, and to the party injuried civilly, that which our Saviour prescribeth (o) as a duty of Christian Charity, which every Church Member oweth to another. It was an impious word of *Cain*, *Am I my Brothers Keeper?* though spoken in reference to his Brothers body and naturall life; How much more sinfull is it, to say or thinke in reference to our Brothers soule, *Am I my Brothers Keeper?* Every Christian is bound by the commandement of God to rebuke his Brother, when he seeth, heareth, or knoweth him to commit sinne: *Lev.* 19. 17. *Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sinne upon him.* Where the Marginall paralell in the English Bibles is *Mat.* 18. 15. Yea, *Erastus* himself *lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *pag.* 154. confesseth that Christ doth in *Matth.* 18. interpret that Law *Lev.* 19. So *Prov.* 28. 4. *Such as keep the Law contend with the wicked.* We ought to hate and abhorre sinne by which God is dishonoured (and consequently to expresse our zeale against it by rebukes when it is committed in our sight, hearing, presence, privity or knowledge) as much yea much more, then if it were a private and personall injury against our selves *Psal.* 97. 10. *Amos*, 5. 15. *Rom.* 12. 9.

Psal.

(o) *Cartwright Histor. christi ex* 4. *Evang. pag.* 354. Hoc loco (Mat. 18) notandum, singulorum in Ecclesia civium munus esse, ut delinquentem fratrem corpiant.

Psal. 139.21,22. Hence it is that the Apostle exhorteth Christians to *warne them that are unruly or disorderly*, 1 *Thess.* 5.13. Wherefore it is justly and truly maintained by *Augustine Regul.3 infine Tomi primi. Durandus lib.4. dist.19. Quæst.3. Tostatus in Math.* 18. *Quæst.* 29. and divers thers, that to admonish and rebuke a Brother committing sinne, is a necessary Christian duty commanded by the word of God, whereunto Christians are obliged by the love of God and their Neighbour: for which see also *Ægidius de Coninck de actib. supernat. disp.*28. *dub.* 2. & 4. And if the offender be not reduced by more private admonitions and rebukes, the same Law of spirituall love bindeth his Brother that knoweth his sinne and impenitency to tell the Church, as *Ioseph* told his Father of his Brethrens faults, *Gen.* 37.2. *and Ioseph brought unto their Father their evill report*, that is their scandalous sinnes which made them to have an evill report. It is well noted by *Pareus* upon the place, that the thing which *Joseph* did complaine of to his Father, was not his Brethrens hatred against himselfe, nor any personall injury done to himself, (becaus their hatred of *Ioseph* was the effect, not the cause, of the information which he gave to his Father of their faults) but it was their sinne and scandalous life by which they brought an evill name upon themselves and the family of their Father. Wherein he doth upon good reason justifie what *Ioseph* did, becaus he told not his Brethrens faults to an Enemy but to a Father, nor for their evill, but for their good. It was also declared unto the Apostle by them of the house of *Cloe* that there were contentions among the *Corinthians* 1 *Cor.* 1.11. So it is collected from 2 *Thess.* 3.11. that some in the Church of *Thessalonica* gave notice to the Apostle of such as walked disorderly. And as he that spares the Rod hates the Child, so he that neglects to rebuke an offending Brother, or (when that cannot amend him) neglects to tell the Church, doth hate his Brothers soule, in so farre as he suffers sinne upon him.

If these things be acknowledged for truths, we will be easily induced to beleive that the scope of Jesus Christ *Math.* 18.15, 16,17. is to teach us, not what he permits the party injured to doe toward the party injuring, but what he commands every one that loves the soule and salvation of his Neighbour, to doe for.

for reducing his Neighbour from a sinne wherewith he is overtaken. Which fitly agreeth with (p) that which *Drusius præter. lib.* 1. on *Mat.* 18. 15. citeth *è libro Musar.* Besides, both Fathers, Schoole-men, Casuists, Commentators, Popish, and Protestant, when they handle the Questions *de correptione fraterna*, they make Brotherly rebukes to be a common duty of love which one neighbour oweth to another, and ever and anon they cleare what they hold from *Mat.* 18. I verily believe it is one of the wiles yea depths of Sathan in perverting that Text with the Erastian Glosses, to throw out of the Church and to drown in desuetude and oblivion, a great and necessary duty which every Christian by the law of love oweth to the soule of his Brother with whom he converseth, which were it conscionably practised, I dare say, it should be a most powerfull and effectuall meanes (by the blessing of Christ upon his owne ordinance) to purge the Church of scandals, to gaine soules, and to advance holinesse.

(p) Si peccaverit in te frater tuus] Eadem habentur in libro Musar 221. quamquam paulò aliter, *Qui arguit socium debet primùm hoc facere placidè inter se & ipsum solùm verbis mollibus, ita ut non pudefaciat eum Si respicit, bene est: sin, debet eum acriter arguere, & pudefacere inter se & ipsum. Si non respicit, debet adhibere socios, ipsumque coram illis pudore afficere: si nec hoc modo quicquam profecit, debet eum pudefacere coram multis, ejusque delictum publicare. Nam certè dilegendi sunt Hypocritæ.*

Now he that can neither be reduced by more private reprehensions nor by publike Ecclesiasticall conviction, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man*, saith Christ, let him be esteemed as one that hath no part in the communion of the Saints, in Church-Membership, in the holy things, in the commonwealth of Israel, in the Covenants of promise, more then an Heathen man. Which is a spirituall, not a civill separation, according to that *Gal.* 2. 15. *We who are Jewes by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles.*

My second Argument shall be this. That which Christ saith generally of any sinne whereby one Brother scandalizeth another Brother, the Erastians restrict to private or personall injuries. And whereas Christs rule tendeth to the rescuing and saving of a sinner, their Glosse runnes upon a mans particular interest in the reparciating of a private injury. *If thy Brother trespasse against thee*, that is, *Cum quis coram aliquo peccaverit*, saith *Munsterus*, *when any brother sinneth in the presence of some other.* Are we not oblidged to rebuke an offending Brother in Christian love; and to endeavour to bring him to repentance and to save his soule; whether he hath done to us any particular injury or not: May we suffer sinne upon his soule, because that sinne is not

not an injury to us? Let it be well observed, the thing here aimed at, is the salvation of the offending Brother, and his turning from sinne, as *Grotius* rightly noteth from the word κερδαίνειν, (which [q] *Erastus* also confesseth from the word ἔλεγξον) for in that sence is the same word used 1 *Cor.* 9. 19,20, 21, 22. *that I might gain them that are under the Law*, &c. and 1 *Pet.* 3.1. *they may be wonne by the conversation of the wives.* This (saith *Grotius*) *James* doth explain *Ch.* 5. *v.* 20. *he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soule from death, and shall hide a multitude of sinnes.* If this then be the meaning of Christs words, thou hast gained thy Brother: then it concerneth all sinnes whereby we know our Brothers soule and salvation to be in hazard. Wherefore though *Grotius* understand private injuries to be that case which the Text putteth, yet saith he, it is the manner of the Law of God, by one particular and more remarkable kind of things, to intimate what ought to be done in other things according to the rule of just proportion. And it holds more true in other sinnes, then in the case of private injuries: *This rebuking is necessary as well in sins which are committed against God as in those which are committed against man, and by so much the more its necessary in sinnes which are committed against God, by how much they are heavier then sinnes which are committed against man,* saith *Tostatus in Mat.* 18. *quest.* 93. And *Grotius* himself citeth out of *Mimus*,

Amici vitia si feras facias tua.

And whereas the *Erastian* take much hold of the words *against thee. If thy Brother trespasse against thee.* I have before answered, that any sinne against God which is committed in my sight, hearing, or knowledge, and so becommeth a scandall or stumbling Block to me, is a trespasse committed against me, because he that ought to edifie me doth scandalize me. So that the words *against thee* are added, to signifie, not a civill injury, but rather a spirituall injury or scandall. *Augustine regul.* 3. *in fine Tom.* 1. applieth the rule and method of proceeding mentioned *Mat.* 18. to lascivious or adulterous behaviour, which one Brother observing in another, ought to admonish him, first secretly, then to take witnesses, then to tell the Church, and if he be contumacious, *de vestra societate projiciatur, let him*

(q) *Confirm. Thes. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. *p.* 188. Ideo dicit Christus ἔλεγξον apud Math. ut intelligamus eum erroris & iniquitatis convincendum esse, ut eam agnoscat ac deprecetur non apud nos tantum, sed multò magis apud Deum.

be cast out of your society saith he, and the context carrieth it to any scandall whereby one Brother scandalizeth another: whereof much was spoken in the preceding part of the Chapter. *Erastus* pag. 154. *Scopus Christi est in hoc capite docere, quantum malum sit scandalum. The scope of Christ is in this Chapter to teach how great an evill scandall is.* Wherefore I adhere to the resolution of *Tostatus in Matth.* 18. *quæst.* 84, *sive sit peccatum directè contra deum, sive contra proximum, si sit nobis scientibus, sit contra nos, cum nos scandalizet.* Both *Chrysostome* and *Theophilact* upon *Matth.* 18.15. observe this cohesion, that Christ having before spoken against those that give scandall, now he gives a rule to the person scandalized.

Thirdly, that exposition which now I argue against, tendeth to make one Scripture contradict another, and to make that lawfull by one Scripture, which another Scripture makes unlawfull, even some of themselves being Judges. They so expound *Matth.* 18. that they make it lawfull (and as such allowed by Christ himself) for a Christian to pursue his Brother for a civill injury before Infidell or Heathnish Judges, even as he would pursue an Heathen or Infidell, if such an one had done him the injury. [1] *Erast.* saith freely (yet foully) that if a Congregation of the faithfull be under the Turke or the Pope, one of them may pursue another for an injury (when the offender will not hearken to his own Assembly) before those Judges who are aliens, and Enemies to the true Religion. His exposition of *Matth.* 18. doth plainly lead hereunto. So saith Bishop *Bilson* (a great follower of *Erastus*) in this debate upon *Matth.* 18. in the place before cited, *let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a publican, that is pursue him in those courts, where thou wouldest a Pagan and Publican that should do thee wrong.* But how doth this agree with 1 *Cor.* 6. (the place which *Erastus thes.* 41. conceiveth to be a Commentary upon *Matth.* 18.) doth not the Apostle expressely condemne it, as being utterly a fault that one brother went to Law with another for the things of this life or civill causes, before the unjust and unbeleevers? Nay, let us heare Bishop *Bilson* himself in that very place. *Paul saith he by no means permitted them to pursue their Brethren at the Tribunals of Infidels.* What then? will they set *Paul* against Christ? or will they

(1) *Confirm. Thes. lib. 3. cap. 2 pag. 184.* Habitant nunc sub Turca & pontifice Romano fideles; Si quis afficiatur ibi à fratre injuriâ, nec audire injuriosus suum cœtum velit, quid aliud poterit offensus facere quàm ejus implorare Judicis opem, qui facultatem habet coercendi?

they make 1 *Cor.* 6. contrary to *Matth.* 18. As for that whereby *Erastus* would reconcile this difference, it is as good as nothing. He saith pag. 183. that *Paul* requireth them to referre to arbitrators within the Church it self, only the smallest matters and things pertaining to this life, but not crimes or weighty matters which he would reserve to the Magistrates, otherwise he had detracted much from those to whom he every where commandeth to give obedience. And so (saith he) that which *Paul* saith is nothing but what Christ saith, *Tell the Church.* Besides *Paul* himself appealed to *Cesar.* let all men judge (saith he) whether the Apostle would make it unlawfull to other wronged persons, which he thought lawfull for himself? I answer, 1. If it was a shame and foule scandall for Christians to pursue one another for smaller matters pertaining to this life, how much more for crimes and weightier matters? for then the unbeleevers might cast the heavier load of reproaches upon the Christian religion. 2. This might have opened a door to elude that which the Apostle so earnestly presseth; for one would be ready to say, this cause of mine is a weighty one, it is an injury and crime that can not be born, therefore I am free to pursue it before unbeleivers. Whereas the Apostle saith, *Why do ye not rather take wrong? why doe ye not rather suffer your selves to be defrauded?* 3. The judging of the smallest matters, and of the things pertaining to this life, is by the Apostle opposed, not to weighty civill injuries, but to the judging of the world and of Angells, as is manifest by the *Antitheses* in the Text. But he maketh no intimation of the least distinction of civill injuries, as if some might be pursued before unbeleiving Judges, some not: he speaketh generally *vers.* 1. *Dare any of you having a matter against another.* vers. 4. *If then ye have judgements of things pertaining to this life* vers. 7. *Why doe ye not rather take wrong?* 4. If that which *Paul* saith, be the same with that which Christ saith *Tell the Church*, and if it was *Pauls* mind that he who would not hearken to chosen arbitrators among the Saints might be pursued before the unbeleiving Judges (as *Erastus* tells us both here and *Thes.* 47.) then *Tell the Church* cannot be meant of telling the Magistrate of the same religion; for *Paul* sends them to no Christian Magistrate (be-

cause there was none such then and there) but to arbitrators chosen among the Saints. Tis most strange to me that so acute a disputant could expound the Telling of the Church *Matth.* 18. by the reference to arbitrators 1. *Cor.* 6. and yet understand the Church *Matth.* 18. to be the civill Magistrate. 5. There might be subjection and obedience to the Heathen Magistrates, although the Saints should not go to Law one against another before them 6. *Paul* did but appeal from *Cæsars* Deputy to *Cæsar* himself. He was drawne by the Jewes before the Tribunall of *Festus* (wherein *Paul* was a sufferer) and finding *Festus* unjust and partiall, and that he endeavoured to deliver him to the Jewes, who had a mind to have him put to death, thereupon he appealeth from *Festus* to *Cæsar*. So that if *Erastus* had made the parallell right, all that he could conclude from *Pauls* example, had been this, that when a Christian is drawne and compelled by his accusers and Enemies (not being Christians) before the Tribunall of an inferiour Heathen Judge, if he there find himself in danger of his life, he may appeale in his just defence to an higher Heathen Judge. Wherefore I yet conclude that by the Erastian principles Christ and *Paul* cannot be reconciled. These three Arguments doe militate not onely against *Erastus* and *Bilson*, but likewise against *Sutlivius de Presb. Cap.* 9. where he gives this sence of *Matth.* 18.15, 16, 17. that we ought to take heed we give no scandall in the pursuing of injuries, and for that end ought to give admonition first privately, then before witnesses, and in case of obstinacy in the brother that hath done the injury, to tell the Rulers of the Church (meaning the Prelates) and if he will not hear them, then to go to Law with that Brother, as with an Heathen or Publican. The other Arguments which are to follow, (the last excepted) strike not at his Interpretation, but at those other Glosses, of *Erastus*, *Bilson*, and Master *Prynne*.

Fourthly, this *Erastian* exposition makes these words, *but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a publican*, to be applicable onely to such Christians as live under unbeleiving Magistrates, and not to all Christians. This consequence *Erastus* foresaw, that it would needs follow from his Interpretation, therefore he plainly owneth it *Thes.* 47. He confesseth.

confeſſeth that the former part concerning rebuking and ſeeking to gaine the offending Brother, belongs to all Chriſtians; What a boldneſſe is here to rent aſunder this paſſage of Scripture, which was uttered as it were with one breath? And why doth not the latter part alſo belong unto all Chriſtians? Muſt Chriſtians that live under an Infidell Magiſtrate have more effectuall meanes and wayes to uſe towards an offending Brother, and may they go a ſtep further in putting him to ſhame or in humbling him, then thoſe Chriſtians can doe who live under a Chriſtian Magiſtrate? How well doth this hang together? I ſhould have thought the ballance muſt rather fall to this hand. But to make the condition of thoſe, who live under a Chriſtian Magiſtrate to be more privative, and the condition of thoſe who live under an Infidell Magiſtrate to be more cumulative, is too great a paradoxe for me.

Sixthly, Whereas they ſay that the way preſcribed by Chriſt *Matth.* 18. is ſuch as is agreeable to the Law of *Moſes*, and they underſtand by *Tell the Church*, Tell the Magiſtrate, I aske what Magiſtrate? If the Judges and Magiſtrates of the Cities, as Biſhop *Bilſon* thinkes, then he who did not hearken to thoſe Judges might appeale to the great *Sanhedrin* at *Hieruſalem*, or the Judges themſelves might referre and tranſmit the caſe thither: ſo that the man was not to be ſtraight way accounted as an Heathen man and a Publican. But if by the Church they underſtand the great *Sanhedrin* it ſelf, he that would not hearken to it was to be put to death by the Law *Deut.* 17. So that it had not been agreeable to the Law of *Moſes*, to teach that he who will not hearken to the great *Sanhedrin* is to be eſteemed as an Heathen man and a Publican; for this ſuppoſeth that he ſhall not dye but be ſuffered to live.

Seventhly, the Eraſtian principles do plainly contradict and confute themſelves. For both *Eraſtus*, Biſhop *Bilſon*, and Maſter *Prynne* hold that the Jewiſh Sanhedrin in Chriſts time was a temporall Magiſtracy and a civill Court of juſtice, which had power to ſcourge, impriſon, torture, and outlaw offenders, yea to put to death as the firſt two doe poſitively averre. How then can it be ſaid, *If he neglect to heare the Church, &c.* that is, if he neglect to heare the civill Magiſtrate who hath power to impriſon

(f) Sutlivius de Preſbyterio Cap. 9 *deinde loquitur Chriſtus de Eccleſia, quæ cogendi poteſtatem non habuit, cujuſque ſententiam impunè licuit contemnere. Nam ſi cogendi poteſtatem habuiſſet, fruſtra illa verba addita ſunt, ſi Eccleſia nolle audire noluerit: nam Eccleſia coegiſſet, & ſententiam ſuam executioni mandaſſet.* This he objecteth againſt the Preſbyterian Interpretation. But in truth it helpeth us and ſtrongly militareth againſt the Eraſtian Interpretation.

imprison, scourge, torture, outlaw, yea to put him to death? Surely if he neglect to heare the Church, doth intimate that the Church hath not used nor cannot use any externall coercive power. *Erastus* findes himselfe so mightily puzled with this difficulty, that to make out his interpretation of *Matth.* 18. he confesseth *Thes.* 53. and *confirm. Thes. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. the Jewish Sanhedrin had no power under the *Romans* to judge of civill causes and injuries, but of things pertaining to their religion onely, [t] so that at that time (saith he) a man might *impune* without punishment contemne the judgement of the Sanhedrin in civill things. And thus while he seeketh a *Salvo* for his Glosse upon *Matth.* 18. he overthroweth the great argument by which he and his followers endeavour to prove that there was no other Sanhedrin in Christs time, but a civill Court of justice, because say they, that Sanhedrin had the power of the Sword and other temporall punishments.

t Pag. 158. *Proinde impune poterat, qui vellebat judicium Synedrii contemnere in civilibus rebus.*

Eighthly, observe the gradation in the Text, 1. a private conviction or rebuke. 2. Conviction before two or three witnesses. 3. Conviction before the Church, and the Churches declaring the thing to be an offence, and commanding the offender to turn from his evill way. 4. If he will not heare the Church (which implieth that the Church hath spoken and required him to doe somewhat which he refuseth to doe) then *Let him be as an Heathen man and a Publican.* This last is heavier then all that went before, and is the punishment of his not hearing the Church. now this gradation is in consistent with the Interpretation which *Erastus* giveth; for by his owne confession the Sanhedrin of the Jewes at that time had not power to judge of civill causes nor to punish any man for a civill injury, but for a matter of religion onely. (yet they are not matters of Religion, but civill trespasses which he understands to be meant *Matth.* 18.) Here is an intercision in the third step of the gradation. And if it were an offence in the matter of religion, it had not been a greater punishment, but a greater ease to the offender, to draw him before the Roman tribunals, for the Romans cared for none of those things, of which the Jewish Sanhedrin was most zealous. The gradation in the Text is as inconsistent with Mr *Prynnes* interpretation; for imagine the offender

offender to be after previous admonitions publiquely accused and convict before the Church (that is, in his opinion) the civill Court of justice which had power to imprison, scourge, torture, and outlaw offenders, if not to condemne, and put to death) what should be done with such an one? can we goe no higher? yes: thus it is in Mr *Prynnes* sence. He that will not submit to the Magistrate, and cannot be reduced by stripes and imprisonment, torturing and outlawing, yea peradventure by condemnation to die the death; let this be the last remedy for such an one, *Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a Publican*, that is, withdraw familiar civill company from him.

Ninthly, that interpretation of *Erastus* leaneth to a false supposition, namely that the word ὥσπερ ὁ τελώνης *as a Publican*, are meant universally of all Publicans good or bad, or whatever they were. To prove this he takes an argument pag. 189, 190, 195. from the Article ὁ; for with the Grecians, saith he, the Article being joyned to the predicate, noteth the nature and consequently the universality of the thing; whence he concludeth that ὁ τελώνης signifieth a Publican *qua* Publican, and so every Publican. Now what can be the sence of Christs words in reference to every Publican (saith he) unlesse this be it, that it was lawfull to pursue any Publican at a Tribunall of the *Romans*? I answer, his argument goeth upon a most false supposition, which I cleare by the like instances, *Matth.6.7. Use not vaine repetitions as the Heathen doe* ὥσπερ οἱ ἐθνικοί. Shall we thence conclude that the Heathens as Heathens, and so all Heathens without exception did use repetitions in prayer, or that they were all so devout in their way as to make long prayers? *Luke* 15.11. *I am not as other men are* ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *extortioners, unjust, &c.* Did the Pharisee meane that every man *eo ipso* that he was another man, and so the rest of the Pharisees as well as others, were extortioners, &c. *John* 15.6. *he is cast forth as a branch* ὡς τὸ κλῆμα. If the rule of *Erastus* hold, then a branch as a branch, and so every branch is cast out. Many such instances might be given. If in these Texts there must be a restriction of the sence, notwithstanding of the prepositive article, so that by *Heathens* we must understand devout or praying

ing

ing Heathens: by *other men*, vulgar men, or the common sort of men; by *a branch*, a fruitlesse or withered branch. Why shall we not also understand by ὁ τελώνης, the prophane loose or unjust Publican, and as *Grotius* doth rightly expound it ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς. Let him be esteemed, saith he, as an Heathen man, that is, as an alien from religion, or as a Publican; that is, if he be a Jew, esteeme him as an infamous sinner, or one of a flagitious life. Since therefore *Erastus* confesseth pag. 194. that as the office of the Publicans was lawfull, so likewise many Publicans were honest, chast, religious, and pious men, I may safely conclude, that *Let him be unto thee as a Publican*, cannot be meant universally of all Publicans. For how can it be supposed that Christ would tacitely allow of alienation from or severity to pious Publicans?

Tenthly, whereas the Erastians lay great waight upon that forme of speech, *Let him be to thee*, (not to the whole Church) as an Heathen man and a Publican, (which is also one of *Sullivius* his exceptions *de Presbyterio, cap. 9.*) in this also they do abuse the Text, for 1. The same offence which is a sufficient ground to one Church-member to esteem another Church member as an Heathen man or a Publican, being a publique and known scandall (such as is contumacy and disobedience to the Church) must needs be a sufficient ground to all other Church members, or to the whole Church to esteem so of him. Surely Christ would not have contradictory judgements in his Church concerning so high a point, as is the esteeming of a Church member to be as a Heathen man and a Publican. 2. The Erastians herein argue no better than the Papists: Christ said to *Peter*, *I will give unto thee the keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven.* Therefore unto *Peter* alone. Peradventure Mr. *Hussey* was so sagacious as to prevent this objection with his popish concession: *these Keyes were never given to any of the Apostles but to Peter*, saith he, in his *plea for Christian magistracy*, pag. 9. It seems he will farre lesse sticke to grant the Prelaticall argument, *Timothy* laid on hands, and *Titus* ordained Elders, therefore each of these had the power of ordination by himselfe alone. 3. It is a good observation of *Luther Tom. 1. Resolv. super propos. 13. de potest. Papæ. fol. 299.* in the sixteenth of *Matthew* Christ begins with all

all his disciples, *Whom say ye that I am?* and he endeth with one, *Unto thee will I give, &c.* In the eighteenth of *Matthew* he beginneth with one, *If thy brother trespasse against thee, &c.* and he endeth with all, *What soever he binds on earth, &c.* Whence he concludeth that in both these places what is said to one is said to all of them.

Chap. V.

That Tell it to the Church *hath more in it, then,* Tell it unto a greater number.

There is yet another interpretation of these words invented to elude the argument for Ecclesiasticall government and censures from *Mat.* 18. *Tell it unto the Church,* that is, if the offending brother will neither hearken to private admonition, nor to admonition before two or three witnesses, then tell it unto many or unto a greater company. This cals to mind[u] Dr *Sutcliffes* glosse upon the word *Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. that it signifieth Presbyters or Ministers *non juris vinculo, sed utcunque collectos*, as if the occasionall meeting of some Presbyters in *Westminster Hall*, or upon the Exchange, or in a journey, or at a buriall, were a Presbytery with power to lay on hands.

[u] *Sutcliv. de Presbyt. cap. 1.*

That interpretation of the word *Church* is no better. But that I may reject nothing without reason, I desire it may be considered, 1. Whether either in Scripture, or in any Greeke Lexicon, or in any Classick author, it can be found that the word ἐκκλησία was ever used to signifie meerly a greater number or company then two or three, not called out and imbodied together for government or worship. For my part I could never yet finde where the simple majority of the number maketh the denomination of ἐκκλησία. I finde the word sometimes (yet very seldome) used of an unlawfull assembly combining or joyning together to evill: the reason I take to be this, because they pretended to be authorised as a lawfull assembly; so Christ called *Judas, friend*, when he came to betray him //

with a kisse. But since the word ἐκκλησία *Matth.* 18.17. doth signifie a lawfull assembly, (as all doe confesse) I desire some testimony of Scripture or approved authors, where this name is given to a lawfull assembly, which was not imbodied for worship or government, but had the name of ἐκκλησία simply because of the majority of number. Sure I am ἐκκλησία is at least *cætus evocatus*, an assembly called forth; and every offended brother hath not from Christ the priviledge of gathering a Church. 2. If by *tell it unto the Church* were meant no more but this, *tell it unto a greater number*, then if the offender doe not heare the Church, there must be recourse unto some others distinct from the Church, for the more authoritative and ultimate determination, (unlesse it be said that there is no remedy for offences, but in a greater number which each man shall make choice of) But where is their more effectuall remedy, or where will they fixe the ultimate degree of proceedings? 3. When Christ saith *Tell it unto the Church*, *and if he neglect to heare the Church, &c.* whether respect be had to the forme of the Hebrews, or to the forme of the Grecians, the Church will still have a ruling power. In the old Testament, the originall giveth the name *Kahal*, *Church*, (which is the word used in the Hebrew Evangel of *Matthew* published by *Munsterus*, chap. 18. vers. 17.) and the Septuagints the name ἐκκλησία to the Elders and Rulers of *Israel*, as 1 *Chro.* 13.2.4. & 29.1. 2 *Chro.* 1.3. and in other places. And that which is said of the Elders, *Deut.* 19.12. *Josh.* 20.4. is said of the Congregation or Church, *Num.* 35.24. *Jos* 20.6. So *Exod.* 12.3. compared with vers. 21. The Septuagints also render *Kahal* by συνάξεων *Prov.* 26.26. It was not therefore to any assembly, but to an assembly of rulers, that causes were brought in the old Testament. If we turne to the Heathen Grecians, among them ἐκκλησία had a power of jurisdiction to judge and determine causes, as is manifest from *Acts* 19.38.39. There ἐκκλησία was of two sorts, as *Suidas*, *Budæus*, *Stephanus*, and others have observed. 1. νόμιμος and συνοδικὴ ἐκκλησία, a lawfull set fixed assembly, which met at ordinary diets (which is meant in that place of the *Acts* last cited) It was also called κυρία ἐκκλησία because of the jurisdiction and ruling power which was seated in it. Wherein I am con-

confirmed by this passage of *Aristotle polit. lib. 3. cap. 11.* ἡ γὰρ ἐκκλησία κυρία πάντων τῶν τοιούτων ἐστί. *for the assembly*, saith he, *hath the government or arbitrement of all such things*; He is speaking of the choosing of Magistrates, and of craving an account of their administration. 2. σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία which was indicted and called *pro re nata*, upon some urgent extraordinary cause, and it was *concio magnatum sive optimatum*, in which the people were not present, as in the other. It was therefore rightly noted by *Passor* that *Demosthenes* useth the word ἐκκλησία *pro concione magnatum.* Afterward the Roman Senate was called σύγκλητος βουλὴ, and sometimes σύγκλητος without an adjection. ἐκκλησία therefore among the Heathen Grecians (from whom the word came) was not any assembly, but an assembly which had a jurisdiction or ruling power. It shall not be in vaine to adde that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι to appeale to a superiour Ruler commeth from the same originall verbe from which commeth ἐκκλησία.

4. The Church mentioned *Matth.* 18.17. hath a forensicall or juridicall power, as appeareth by that of the two or three witnesses vers. 16. which relateth to a Juridicall proceeding in the trying and punishing of offences, as M. *Prynne* hath observed. Peradventure some man will say, that the two or three witnesses here are brought in onely to be witnesses to the admonition, or to make the admonition the more effectuall, and the more to be regarded, but not as if any use were to be made of these witnesses, to prove the fact or offence it selfe before the Church, if there be occasion. I answer, either it must be supposed here that the trespasse was seen or knowne onely by him that gives the first rebuke privately, or that it was also seen or known by those two or three witnesses. If the former, it is much disputed among Schoolmen whether he that rebukes his offending brother be to proceed any further than a private rebuke for a private offence, or whether he is to stop at private rebukes, and not to take witnesses with him (which divers thinke to be unfit and disallowed, as being an officious and unnecessary irritation of the offending brother by the spreading of his shame, a making of a private sinne to become scandalous to others, as likewise an engaging of witnesses to

assist in the admonition and rebuke by a blinde and implicite faith) for my part I shall not need here to dispute this point: for whatever ought to be done, or ought not to be done in this case, when the trespasse is known to one onely: yet in the other case when besides him that rebukes there are two or three more which can be witnesses of the fact or trespasse committed (the trespasse being yet not publiquely divulged) it can not be denied, that these witnesses of the fact are to be brought unto and confronted with the offender; when he cannot be gained by private rebuke, and (if need be) prove it afterward before the Church. Which I have before noted out of *Durand.* And[x] *Aegidius de Coninck* tels us (in whatsoever other case witnesses are to be taken, or are not to be taken) in this case all doe consent that witnesses are to be taken.

x *De actib. supernat. Disp.* 28. *Dub.* 9. Item quando peccatum corripiendi

p æter me est uni vel alteri notum, etiam facile mihi est hos post primam correptionem adjungere mihi socios ac testes secundæ correptionis. Cum enim hi non minus quàm ego ejus peccatum noverint, æqualiter poterunt ipsum de hoc corripere, illudúe postea, si opus sit, coram Superiore testari. Quare communiter omnes censent in eo casu testes esse adhibendos, si prima correptio non fuerit efficax. Sed tota difficultas est quando peccatum est mihi soli notum. Qua in re triplex est sententia. Prima docet quando tunc proximus non emendatur secreta me admonitione, non esse ulterius progrediendum, &c.

Concerning the taking of witnesses, when the trespasse is known to me alone, there are three different opinions. 1. That when I have rebuked the offender privately, and cannot gaine him, I am to proceed no further, but have done my duty and must leave the event to God. 2. That when a secret admonition is not effectuall, witnesses are to be taken, in case the offender so admonished continue in his sinne, or in case his relapse be feared and expected, that the witnesses may observe such continuing or relapse in sinne, and then assist and joyne in rebuking him, and if need be (that is, in case of his contumacy) to prove the fact before the Church. 3. That even when his continuance or relapse in sinne can not be observed, (and so can not be afterward proved by witnesses) yet the second admonition is to be given before witntsses, when the first admonition given privately hath not gained the offender. Of these let the Reader judge. Tis enough for the point now in hand, that when witnesses can be had to prove the trespasse committed

mitted, they ought to be brought, first before the offender, and then (if he continue obstinate) before the Church to prove the fact: and they must be three, or two at the least, which I doe not see how it can be thought necessary, if we suppose that the sinne is not known to any but to me alone who give the first rebuke; for if there must be a witnesse of my second admonition, why may not one witnesse joyn with me as well as two, when I can not have two, but one onely, willing and ready to joyn with me. But now a necessity of precept lies on me, that I must have two witnesses at least, which cannot be otherwise understood, but in reference to a forensicall proceeding afterwards, if need be.

5. That interpretation which now I speak against, while it goeth about to avoyd a power of Jurisdiction and Censure in this Text, it doth subject him that is reproved by another, to a heavier yoke, and brings him into a greater servitude. For though a man be not disobedient nor contumacious unto any Court Civill or Ecclesiasticall; yet if he doth not hearken to such a number, as the party offended shall declare the case unto (being a greater number then two or three) he must be by and by esteemed and avoyded as an Heathen man and a Publican.

6. This interpretation, as it is fathered upon *Grotius*, so it may be confuted out of *Grotius* upon the very place. He expounds *Tell it unto the Church* by the same words which *Drusius* citeth, è *libro Musar.* declare it *coram multis*, before many. But is this any other then ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων the *many* spoken of 2 *Cor.* 2. 6? a place cited by *Grotius* himself, together with ἐνώπιον πάντων *before all*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. Now these were acts of Ecclesiasticall power and authority, not simply the acts of a greater number. He tels us also it was the manner among the Jewes to referre the businesse *ad multitudinem* τῆς ὁμοζήλων, to the assembly of those who were of the same way, or followed the same rites, the judgements of which multitude (saith he) *seniores tanquam præsides moderabantur*, *the Elders as Presidents did moderate.* He further cleares it out of *Tertullian apol. cap.* 39. where speaking of the Churches or assemblies of Christians, he saith: *ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes & censura divina &c. præsident probati quique seniores. Where there are also exhortations, corrections,*

and

and Divine censure, &c. all the approved Elders doe preside. And is not this the very thing we contend for?

I hope I may now conclude that *Tell the Church* is neither meant of the civill Magistrate, nor simply of a greater number, but of the Elders or (as others expresse it better) of the Eldership or Assembly of Elders; So *Stephanus*, *Scapula*, and *Pasor* in the word ἐκκλησία, *Calvin*, *Bucerus*, *Illyricus*, *Beza*, *Hunnius*, *Tossanus*, *Pareus*, *Cartwright*, *Camero*, *Diodati*, the Dutch annotations, all upon the place. *Marlorat in Thesauro* in the word *Ecclesia Zanchius in* 4. *Præc. pag.* 741. *Iunius Animad. in Bell. Contr.* 3. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 6. *Gerhard loc. theol. Tom.* 6. *pag.* 137. *Meisuerus Disput. de regim. Eccles. quæst.* 1. *Trelcatius Instit. Theol. lib.* 1. *pag.* 291. *Polanus Syntag. lib.* 7. *cap.* 1. *Bullinger in* 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. *Whittaker. de Ecclesia quæst.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Danæus in* 1 *Tim. pag.* 246. 394. These and many more understand that neither the Magistrate nor the multitude of the Church, nor simply a great number, is meant by the Church *Matth.* 18. but the Elders or
" Ecclesiasticall senate, who have the name of the Church, partly,
" by a Synecdoche because they are a chief part of the Church (as otherwhere the people or flock distinct from the Elders, is called the Church *Act.* 20. 28.) partly, because of their eminent station and principall function in the Church, as we say we have seen such a mans Picture, when haply tis but from the shoulders upward: partly, because the Elders act in all matters of importance, so as they carry along with them the knowledge and consent of the Church. (And therefore according to *Salmeron* his observation *Tom.* 4. *part.* 3. *Tract.* 9. Christ would not say, Tell the officers or Rulers of the Church, but *Tell the* Church, because an obstinate offender is not to be excommunicate secretly or in a corner, but with the knowledge and consent of the whole Church: so that for striking of the sinner with the greater fear and shame, in regard of that knowledge and consent of the Church, the telling of the officers is called the telling of the Church:) partly also, because of the ordinary manner of speaking in the like cases; that which is done by the Parliament is done by the Kingdom, and that which is done by the common Councell is done by the City. Among the Jewes with whom Christ and his Apostles were conversant this

this manner of speaking was usuall. *Danæus* (where before cited) citeth R. *David Kimchi* upon *Ose.* 5. noting that the name of the house of *Israel* is often put for the *Sanhedrin* in Scripture. Tis certaine the *Sanhedrin* hath divers times the name *Kahal* in the Hebrew and ἐκκλησία in the Greek of the old Testament, Which is acknowledged even by those who have contended for a kind of popular Government in the Church. See *Guide unto Zion* pag. 5. *Ainsworth* in his *Counterpoison* pag. 113.

Chap. VI.

Of the power of binding and loosing Matth. 18. 18.

THey that doe not understand *Matth.* 18. 17. of Excommunication, are extreamely difficulted and scarce know what to make of that binding and loosing which is mentioned in the words immediately following *v.* 18. *verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. Erastus* and *Grotius* understand it of a private brother, or the party offended his binding or loosing of the offender. Bishop *Bilson* understands it of a civill binding or loosing by the Magistrate, whom he conceives to be meant by the Church *vers.* 17. These doe acknowledge a coherence and dependance between *vers.* 17. and 18. Mr *Prynne* differing from them, doth not acknowledge this coherence, and expounds the binding and loosing to be ministeriall indeed, but onely Doctrinall. Some others dissenting from all these, doe referre this binding and loosing not to a person, but to a thing or Doctrine, *whatsoever ye shall bind*, that is, whatsoever ye shall declare to be false, erroneous, impious, &c. *Sutlivius* though he differ much from us in the Interpretation of *vers.* 15, 16, 17. yet he differeth as much (if not more) from the Erastians in the Interpretation of *vers.* 18. for he will have the binding and loosing, to be Ecclesiasticall and spirituall, not civill, to be Juridicall, not Doctrinall onely, to be Acts of Government committed to Apostles, Bishops and

and Paſtors: he alloweth no ſhare to ruling Elders, yet he alloweth as little of the power of binding and looſing, either to the Magiſtrate, or to the party offended. See him *de Preſbyterio Cap.* 9. & 10. So that they can neither ſatisfie themſelves nor others, concerning the meaning and the context.

For the confutation of all thoſe Gloſſes, and for the vindication of the true ſcope and ſence of the Text, I ſhall firſt of all obſerve, whence this phraſe of binding and looſing appeareth to have been borrowed, namely, both from the Hebrewes and from the Græcians. The Hebrews did aſcribe to the Interpreters of the Law, Power, authority אסר δεῖν to bind, and התיר λύειν to looſe. So *Grotius* tells us on *Mat.* 16. 19. The Hebrews had their looſing of an Excommunicated perſon, which they called התרת המנודה See *Buxtorf. Lexic. Chald. Talm. Rabbin.* pag. 1410. The Grecians alſo had a binding and looſing which was judiciall. *Budæus* and *Stephanus* on the word λύω cite out of *Aeſchines* ἐπειδὰν τῇ πρώτῃ ψήφῳ μὴ λυθῇ τὸ παράνομον, *Quum primo ſuffragio non abſolutus fuerit reus* τῶν παρανόμων. ψῆφος was the ſtone by which the Senators did give their ſuffrage in judgement, It was either a blacke ſtone, by which they did bind the ſinner and retaine his ſinne, and that ſtone was called ἡ ἀναιροῦσα ὃν καθαιροῦσα: or it was a white ſtone, by which they did looſe remit and abſolve: and that ſtone was called ἡ σώζουσα οὐ ἡ ἐλεοῦσα: which was the thing that *Tully* calleth *Solvere crimine.* So where it is ſaid, *her iniquity is pardoned* Iſa. 40. 2. the 70 read λέλυται αὐτῆς ἁμαρτία, *her iniquity is looſed.* And becauſe there is uſually ſome kind of expiation before a looſing and remitting of ſinnes, which expiation being performed the looſing follows, therefore the Græcians called ſuch neceſſary and requiſit expiation by the name of λύσις that is, *looſing*: and they had their λύσιοι θεοὶ, they expiatory Gods, who did chiefly take care of thoſe expiations.

That in Scripture the power of binding, is judiciall and authoritative, is cleared by my Reverend and Learned Colleague Maſter *Rutherford* in *The Divine right of Church Government* pag. 234. 235. I adde, that the word אָסַר unto which *Grotius* ſends us, is uſed for that binding or incarceration which is an act of corrective authority, as *Gen.* 40. 3. *Gen.* 42. 16. 19. 24. *Num.* 15. 34 *Levit.*

Levit. 24. 12. 2 Kings. 17. 4. Isa. 42. 7. Jer. 40. 1. *Ezek.* 3. 25. It is also used for an authoritative prohibition *Num.* 11. 28. *my Lord Moses forbid them.* Thence אִסָּר *interdictum*, a decree forbidding somewhat *Dan.* 6,7,8,9.

As binding and loosing are Acts of authority and power, such as doth not belong to any single person or brother offended, so the binding and loosing mentioned *Matth.* 18. 18. are Acts of Ecclesiasticall and spirituall authority, belonging to the Kingdom and Government of Christ in his Church, but not belonging to the civill Magistrate. And as the authority is Ecclesiasticall and spirituall, so it is more than Doctrinall, it is a power of inflicting or taking off Church Censures. These two things I will endeavour to prove. 1. That this power of binding and loosing belongeth neither to private Christians nor to civill Magistrates, but to Church Officers. 2. That this power is juridicall or forensicall, and not Doctrinall onely; that is, that Church-Officers are here authorised to bind with censures, or to loose from censures, as there shall be cause. In both which we have Antiquity for us. Which I doe the rather observe because *Erastus* and *Grotius* alledge some of the Antients, for their exposition of *Math.* 18. 18. that this binding or loosing is by the offended brother. That which *Augustine*, *Origen*, and *Theophylact* say of one brother his binding or loosing, is but spoken tropologically, and not as the literall sence of the Text, yea, *Theophylact* in that passage cited by *Erastus* and *Grotius*, doth distinguish between the Ministeriall or Ecclesiasticall binding and loosing, and the party offended his binding and loosing. *Non enim solùm quæ solvunt sacerdotes sunt soluta, sed quæcunque & nos &c. Theophylact* doth also find excommunication in that Text *Illam autem (Ecclesiam) si non audierit, tunc abjiciatur, ne suæ malitiæ participes faciat alios.* I further appeal to *Augustine* himself *Epist.* 75. where speaking of Excommunication and *Anathema* he distinguisheth it from corporall punishment, and after he hath spoken of the temporall sword he addeth, *Spiritualis autem pœna, qua fit quod scriptum est, Quæ ligaveris in terra, erunt ligata & in cælo, animas obligat. But the spirituall punishment, by which that thing is done which is written, What thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, doth bind soules.* Againe in his

sixth Tome *lib.* 1. *contra adversarium legis & prophetarum cap.* 17.

(y) Ignoscendi autem misericors mansuetudo, &c. non ad hoc valet ut sit iniquitas impunita, aut torpens & dormiens disciplina, quod potius obsit quam diligens vigilansque vindicta. Claves quippe regni cælorum sic dedit Christus Ecclesiæ, ut non soìùm diceret Quæ solveritis super terram, erunt solu a & in cælis: ubi apertissimè bonum, non malum pro malo reddit Ecclesia: veràm & adjungeret: Quæ ligaveritis in terra erunt ligata & in cælo. quia bona est & vindicandi justitia. Illud enim quod ait, Si nec Ecclesiam audierit, sit tibi tanquam ethnicus & publicanus, gravius est quam si gladio feriretur, si flammis absumeretur, si feris subrigeretur. Nam ibi quoque subjunxit, Amen dico vobis quæ ligaveritis super terram erunt ligata & in cælis: ut intelligeretur quanto gravius sit punitus qui velut relictus est impunitus.

(y) Ignoscendi autem misericors mansuetudo, &c. non ad hoc valet ut sit iniquitas impunita, aut torpens & dormiens disciplina, quod potius obsit quam diligens vigilansque vindicta. Claves quippe regni cælorum sic dedit Christus Ecclesiæ, ut non soìùm diceret Quæ solveritis super terram, erunt solu a & in cælis: ubi apertissimè bonum, non malum pro malo reddit Ecclesia: veràm & adjungeret: Quæ ligaveritis in terra erunt ligata & in cælo. quia bona est & vindicandi justitia. Illud enim quod ait, Si nec Ecclesiam audierit, sit tibi tanquam ethnicus & publicanus, gravius est quam si gladio feriretur, si flammis absumeretur, si feris subrigeretur. Nam ibi quoque subjunxit, Amen dico vobis quæ ligaveritis super terram erunt ligata & in cælis: ut intelligeretur quanto gravius sit punitus qui velut relictus est impunitus.

(z) *Hier. in Matth.* 18. 19, Qnia dixerat, Si autem Ecclesiam non audierit, sit tibi sicut ethnicus & publicanus, & poterat contemptoris fratris hæc occulta esse responsio vel tacita cogitatio: si me despicis & ego te despicio: si tu me condemnas, & meâ sententiâ condemnaberis: potestatem tribuit Apostolis, ut sciant qui à talibus condemnantur, humanam sententiam divina sententia roborari, & quodcunque ligatum fuerit in terra, ligari pariter & in cælo. *Hier. Epist.* 1. *ad Heliod.* Absit ut de his quicquam finistrum loquar, qui apostolico gradui succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt, per quos & nos Christiani sumus. Qui claves regni cælorum habentes, quodammodo ante Judicii diem judicant, &c, Mihi ante Presbyterum (*legendum fortasse Presbyterium*) sedere non licet: illi si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit. Et in veteri quidem lege, quicunque sacerdotibus non obtemperasset, aut extra castra positus, lapidabatur à populo, aut gladio cervice subjecta, contemptum expiabat cruore: Nunc verò inobediens, spirituali mucrone truncatur, aut ejectus de Ecclesia, rabido dæmonum ore discerpitur.

(z) *Hierome* both in his Commentary upon *Matth.* 18. and in his Epistle to *Heliodorus*, speaketh of this power of binding as a judiciall forensicall power belonging to the Ministers or Officers of the Church, by which they judge and censure offenders.

But to save my self the labour of more citations, I take help from Bishop *Bilson, of the perpetuall Government of Christs Church cap.* 4. where though he expound the binding and loosing *Matth.* 18. 18. to be Acts of the Magistrate, yet he acknowledgeth that the Antient writers leane vere much another way, and understand that Text of the ministeriall and spirituall power of Excommunication, for which he citeth *Chrysost. de sacerdotio lib.* 3. *Ambros. de pœnitent. lib.* 1. *c.* 2. *Hierom. in Matth. cap.* 18. *Hilar. in Mat. can.* 18. Vnto these I also adde *Isidorus Peluseota* in the third Book of his Epistles, *Epist.* 260. where he applyeth

applieth this Text *Matth.* 18, 19. to this sence, that impenitent sinners are to be bound, and penitent sinners looſed, and thence argueth againſt the abſolving of a perjured perſon who had not declared himſelf penitent, but had purchaſed his abſolution by a gift. Nor can I paſſe *Chryſoſtome* upon this very Text, where he tells that Chriſt will have ſuch a one to be puniſhed καὶ τῇ ἐντεῦθεν τιμωρίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἐκεῖ κολάσει, both with a preſent Chaſtiſement and with a future puniſhment, or both in earth and in heaven; and would have the offender to fear τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβολήν, caſting out of the Church. He addeth οὐκ εὐθέως ἐξέκοψεν, he cuts not off immediately, but after admonitions.

I will now proceed to a further confirmation of the two propoſitions afore mentioned. Touching the firſt, That this binding and looſing *Matth.* 18. 18. belongeth neither to private Chriſtians, nor to civill Magiſtrates, but to Church Officers, I clear it thus. There are two things by which (as Schoolemen obſerve) mens ſoules and conſciences are bound, 1. They are bound by their ſinnes. Prov. 5. 22. *His own iniquities ſhall take the wicked himſelf, & he ſhall be holden with the cords of his ſins.* Act. 8. 23. *thou art in the bond of iniquity.* 2. Men are bound by precepts *Matth.* 23. 4. *They bind heavy burthens and grievous to be born, and lay them on mens ſhoulders.* This binding by precept or law, ſome take to be meant *Ezech.* 3. 25. *O Sonne of man behold they ſhal put bands upon thee, & ſhall bind thee with them,* that is, thou ſhalt in viſion ſee thy ſelf bound with bands upon thee, to ſignifie that I have forbidden thee to be a reprover to the rebellius houſe. So the Chaldee paraphraſe. *But thou o Sonne of man, behold I have put my word upon thee, as a band of cords with which they bind, and thou ſhalt not goe forth into the midſt of them.* Now in both theſe reſpects the Scripture elſewhere doth aſcribe to Church-Officers a power of binding and looſing. 1 In reſpect of ſinne *Jo.* 20. 23. *Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whoſeſoever ſins ye retaine they are retained.* It is ſpoken to the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors in the Miniſtery of the Goſpell. *Matth.* 16. 19. *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdome of heaven: and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth, ſhall be bound in heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on earth ſhall be looſed in heaven.* Where the power of binding and looſing is

given to the Apostles, & *Grotius* upon the place cleareth it from 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. 20. *God hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are Ambassadours for Christ.* So that we find in Scripture Church-Officers inabled and authorised *ex officio* as the Heraulds and Ambassadours of the King of *Zion*, to loose from the bands of sinne all repenting and beleiving sinners, and to bind over to eternall justice and wrath the impenitent and unbeleevers. 2 They are also authorised, dogmatically and authoritatively to declare and impose the will of Christ, and to bind his precepts upon the shoulders of his people *Matth.* 28. 20. as likewise to loose them and pronounce them free from such burthens, as men would impose upon them contrary or beside the word of God 1 *Cor.* 7. 23. An example of both we have Act. 15. 28. The Synod of the Apostles and Elders bindeth upon the Churches such Burthens, as were necessary by the Law of love for the avoiding of scandall, but did pronounce the Churches to be free and loosed from other burthens which the Judaizing Teachers would have bound upon them. Now therefore if we will expound *Matth.* 18. 18. by other Scriptures (it being the onely surest way to expound Scripture by Scripture) it is manifest and undeniable, that Church-Officers are by other Scriptures inabled and authorised to bind & loose in both those respects afore-mentioned. But we no where find in Scripture, that Christ hath given either to all private Christians, or to the civill Magistrate, a Commission and Authority to bind or loose sinners; I know a private Christian may and ought to convince an impenitent brother, and to comfort a repenting brother, *ex charitate Christiana:* But the Scripture doth not say, that God hath committed to every private Christian the word of reconciliation, and that all Christians are Ambassadours for Christ, nor is there a promise to ratifie in heaven the convictions or comforts given by a private Christian: No more then a King doth ingage himself *in verbo principis* to pardon such as any of his good Subjects shall pardon, or to condemne such as any of his good Subjects shall condemne: but a King ingageth himself to ratifie what his Ambassadours, Commissioners or Ministers shall doe in his name and according to the Commission which he hath given them to pardon or condemne. Besides

all

all this, if Christ had meant here of the brother to whom the injury was don, his private binding or loosing, not condemning or forgiving, then he had kept the phrase in the singular number, which *Erastus* observeth diligently all along the Text vers. 15, 16, 17. But he might have also observed, that vers. 18. carries the power of binding and loosing to a plurality, *Whatsoever ye bind, &c.* As for the Magistrate, it belongeth to him to bind with the cords of corporall or civill punishments, or to loose and liberat from the same, as he shall see cause according to law and justice. But this doth n t belong to the spirituall Kingdome of Jesus Christ; for his Kingdome is not of this world, neither are the weapons thereof carnall but spirituall. And beside the Magistrate may lawfully and sometime doth bind on punishment, when the soule is loosed in Heaven, and the sinne remitted. Again, the Magistrate may lawfully, and sometime doth loose and absolve from punishment, when a mans soule is impenitent, and sinne is still bound upon his conscience. There is no such promise that God will forgive whom the Magistrate forgiveth, or condemne whom the Magistrate condemneth. Neither hath God any where in Scripture committed to the Magistrate the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven, or the word of reconciliation, as to the Ambassadours of Christ.

Binding and loosing in the other sence by a dogmaticall authoritative declaration of the will of Christ, is not so principally or direcly intended *Matth.* 18. 18. as that other binding and loosing in respect of sinne. Howbeit it is not to be excluded, because the words preceding Vers. 17. mention not onely the execution of Excommunication, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*; but also the Churches judgement, and determination of the case, *if he neglect to heare the Church*, which words implie, that the Church hath declared the will of Christ in such a case, and required the offender to doe accordingly, but he shewing himselfe unwilling and contumacious, as it were saying in his heart, I will breake their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from me, thereupon the promise reacheth to this also, that what the Church hath determined or imposed according to the will of Christ shall be ratified

ratified and approved in Heaven. [a] Now Christ hath no where given a Commission either to every particular Christian, or to the Magistrate, to teach his people to observe all things which he hath commanded them, and authoritatively to determine controversies of faith, or cases of conscience. As in the old Testament, the Priests lips did preserve knowledge, and they were to seeke the law at his mouth, *Mal.* 2.7. so in the new Testament the Ministers of Christ have the Commission to make known the counsell of God.

[a] *Sutlivius de presbyt. cap.* 14. p. 107 Apostoli religionis & fidei à Christo cognitionem acceperunt: hæc enim pars est maxima clavium quas ille Apostolis suis commisit.

My second proposition that the power of binding and loosing *Matth.*18.18. is juridicall or forensicall, and meant of inflicting or taking off Ecclesiasticall Censures; this I will make good in the next place against Mr *Prynne*, who to elude the argument for Excommunication from *Matth.*18. answereth two things concerning the binding and loosing there spoken of. 1. That these words have no coherence with, or dependence upon the former. 2 That this binding and loosing is meant onely of preaching the Gospell. Touching the first of these, I confesse if by the *Church*, vers. 17. be meant a civill Court of Justice; and by those words, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen, &c.* be meant no more but keepe no civill fellowship with him (which is his sence of the Text) I cannot marvell that he could finde no coherence between vers. 17. and vers. 18. yet if there be no coherence between these verses, the generality of Interpreters have gone upon a great mistake of the Text, conceiving that Christ doth here anticipate a great objection, and adde a great encouragement in point of Church discipline; for when the offender is excommunicated, (that is all the Church can doe to humble and reduce him) put the case he or others despise the censures of the Church, *What will your censure doe?* saith Mr *Hussey:* To that very thing Christ answereth, It shall be ratified in Heaven, and it shall doe more then the binding of the offenders in fetters of Iron could doe. But let us heare what Mr *Prynne* saith against the coherence of Text: because (saith he) that of binding and loosing is *spoken onely to and of Christs disciples, as is evident by the parallel Text of Joh.*20.23. *not of the Jewish Church.*

It maketh the more against him (I am sure) that its spoken to

to and of Christs Disciples, for this proveth that the *Church* verſ. 17. is not the Jewiſh Sanhedrin, but the Christian Preſbytery, then inſtituted, and afterwards erected: and that the thing which makes one as an Heathen and a Publican, is binding of his ſinnes upon him. And for the context, immediatly after Christ had ſaid, *If he neglect to heare the Church, let him be unto thee, &c.* he addeth, *Verily I ſay unto you, whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth, &c.* The dependency is very cleare. A Christian having firſt admoniſhed his brother in private, then having taken two or three witneſſes, after this having brought it to the publique cognizance of the Eccleſiaſticall Conſiſtory, and after all that, the offender being for his obſtinacy excommunicate; here is the laſt ſtep, no further progreſſe. Now might one thinke, what of all this? what ſhall follow upon it? Nay, ſaith Christ, it ſhall not be in vaine, it ſhall be ratified in Heaven. And as the purpoſe cohereth, ſo that forme of words, *Verily I ſay unto you*, is ordinarily uſed by Christ to ſignifie his continuing and preſſing home the ſame purpoſe which he had laſt mentioned, as *Matth.* 5.26. *Matth.* 6.2. *Matth.* 8.10. *Matth.* 10.15. *Matth.* 11.11. *Matth.* 18.3. *Matth.* 19.23,28. *Matth.* 21.31. *Matth.* 23.36. *Matth.* 26.13. *Matth.* 24.34,47. *Marke* 10.15. & 12.43. & 13.30. *Luke* 12.37. and many the like paſſages. To my beſt obſervation, I have found no place where Christs *Verily I ſay unto you*, begins a new purpoſe which hath no coherence with nor dependency upon the former.

This coherence of the Text and the dependency of verſ. 18. upon that which went before (which dependency is acknowledged by *Eraſtus*, who perceiving that he could not deny the dependency, fancieth that the binding and looſing is meant of the offended brothers pardoning or not pardoning of the offender, *Confirm. Theſ. pag.* 157.) doth alſo quite overthrow Maſter *Prynnes* other anſwer, that this binding and looſing is onely meant of preaching the Goſpell, and of denouncing remiſſion of ſinnes to the penitent, and wrath to the impenitent.

Nay, That *poteſtas clavium concionalis* is inſtituted in other places: but here its *poteſtas clavium diſciplinalis*, as is evident: Firſt, by the coherence of the Text, and by the taking of two or three more, and then telling of the thing to the Church; all which

which intimateth a rising as from one or two or three more, so from them to the Church, which cannot be meant of one man, as hath been argued against both Pope and Prelate, for no one man can be called a Church: neither hath one man the power of jurisdiction; but one man hath the power of preaching.

Secondly, the Apostles, and those who succeed them in the worke of the Ministery have the same power of the Keys committed from Christ to them ministerially, which Christ hath committed from the father to him (as Mediator) authoritatively. For in the parallel place, *Joh.*20. v. 21,23. where he gives them power of remitting or retaining sinnes, he saith, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* But the Father gave Christ such a power of the Keyes, as comprehends a power of Government, and not meerely doctrinall, *Isa.*22.21,22. *I will commit the government into his hand, &c. And the Keyes of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder.*

Thirdly, It may be proved also by that which immediately followeth, vers. 19. *Againe I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth &c.* which cannot be meant of the power of preaching; for neither the efficacy of preaching, nor the ratification of it in Heaven, nor the fruit of it on Earth, doth depend upon this, that two preachers must needs agree in the same thing. But it agreeth well to the power of Discipline, concerning which it answereth these two objections. First, it might be said, the Apostles and other Church-governours may fall to be very few in this or that Church where the offence riseth; shall we in that case execute any Church-discipline? Yes, saith Christ, if there were but two Church-officers in a Church (where no more can be had) they are to exercise Discipline, and it shall not be in vaine. Againe, it might be objected, be they two or three, or more, what if they doe not agree among themselves? To that he answereth, there must be an agreement of two Church-officers at least, otherwise the sentence shall be null; we can not say the like of the doctrinall power of binding or loosing, that it is of no force nor validity unlesse two at least agree in the same doctrine, as hath been said; two must agree in that sentence or censure, which is desired to be

be ratified in Heaven, and then they binding on Earth, and unanimously calling upon God to ratifie it in Heaven, it shall be done.

Fourthly, this binding and loosing can not goe without the Church, it is applicable to none but a Church member or a Brother. So the threed of the Text goes along from vers. 15. **If thy Brother** *trespasse against thee*, and vers. 16. *thou hast gained* **thy Brother**. And when it is said, *Tell the Church*, it is supposed that the offender is a member of the Church, over whom the Church hath authority, and of whom there is hope that he will heare the Church. And when it is said, *Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man and a Publican*, it is supposed that formerly he was not unto us as an Heathen man and a Publican. For these and the like reasons *Tostatus in Matth.* 18. *quæst.* 91. and divers others hold that this rule of Christ is not applicable to those who are without the Church. But if the binding and loosing be meant onely of preaching the Gospell, as Master *Prynne* would have it, then it were applicable to those that are not yet baptised nor made Church members, for unto such the Gospell hath been and may be preached. The binding and loosing which is proper to a Brother or to a Church member, must be a juridicall power of censures, of which the Apostle saith, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. *What have I to doe to judge them also that are without? Doe not ye judge them that are within?* Therefore *Chrysostome Hom.* 61. *in Matth.* (according to the Greeke *Hom.* 60.) doth parallel *Matth.* 18. with 1 *Cor.* 5. proving that this rule of Christ is not applicable to one that is without, but onely to a brother. *Which Paul also saith in these words, What have I to doe to judge them also that are without? But he commandeth us to convince and reduce brethren,* καὶ ἀποτέμνειν μὴ πειθομένους *and to cut off the disobedient: this he (Christ) doth also in this place. Theophylact* also on *Matth.* 18. noteth the same restriction of this rule of Christ to a Christian Brother.

Fifthly, this binding power is not to be made use of, till all other meanes have been essayed, *ante tentanda omnia* saith *Munsterus*, first a private admonition, then before witnesses, then the matter is brought to the Church, the Church declareth and judgeth, the offender neglecteth to heare the Church, then

after all this commeth the binding, which must needs be a binding with censures; for that binding which Master *Prynne* speakes of, the denouncing of the wrath of God against the impenitent, by the preaching of the Gospell, is not, neither ought to be suspended or delayed upon such degrees of proceeding.

Sixthly, this binding and loosing is not without two or three witnesses, vers. 16. But that of two or three witnesses relateth to a forensicall or judiciall proceeding, as Mr *Prynne* himselfe tels us. These witnesses may be brought before the Ecclesiasticall court, either to prove the offenders contumacy being admonished, or to prove the scandalous fact it selfe, which was from the beginning knowne to two or three witnesses, according to the sence of Schoolmen, expressed in the precedent Chapter.

Seventhly, this phrase of binding and loosing is taken both from the Hebrews, and from the Grecians. But both the Hebrews and the Grecians used these words in a juridicall sence, as I observed in the beginning.

Eighthly, that the binding and loosing *Matth.* 18. 18. is juridicall, not doctrinall, belonging to the power of jurisdiction, not of order, is the sence of the ancients above cited, as likewise of *Scotus lib.* 4. *Sent. Dist.* 19. *Quæst.* 1. *art.* 5. *Tostatus in Matth.* 18. *Quæst.* 113. yea the current both of Schoolmen and of Interpreters, as well Protestant, as Popish, runneth that way. It were too long to cite all. Yea further *Salmasius in appar. ad lib. de primatu p.* 296 understands the binding and loosing *Matth.* 16. 19. *Joh.* 20. 23. of Discipline. So *Walæus Tom.* 1. *pag.* 92. So divers others. From the same places *Aretius Theol. probl. loc.* 133. *de excom.* draws Excommunication as an Ordinance of Christ. From the same two Texts *Joh.* 20. 23. and *Matth.* 16. 19. *Dionysius Areopagita de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia cap.* 7. *sect.* 7. doth prove that Christ hath committed unto the Ministers of the Church τὰς ἀφοριστικὰς δυνάμεις. His ancient Scholiast *Maximus* upon that place tels us, that he speaks περὶ τῆς ἀκοινωνησιῶν καὶ ἀφορισμῶν *of excommunications and separations*, or (as he there further explaineth) the judging and separating between the righteous and the wicked. *Salmeron* upon *Matth.* 16. 19. thinks that the latter

latter part of that verse, *And whatsoever thou shalt binde on Earth, &c.* doth belong to the power of jurisdiction and censure: *Hugo de S. Victore de Sacramentis lib.1. cap.26.* doth also expound *Matth.* 16. 19. of the forensicall power of Excommunication. Now if in these places binding and loosing, remitting and retaining sinnes comprehend a juridicall power of laying on or taking off Church censures; how much more must this Juridicall power be comprehended *Matth.* 18. 18. where the context and circumstances will much more enforce this sence, then in the other two places? this binding and loosing being also in the plurall number, *Whatsoever ye bind, &c.* not in the singular, as the phrase is *Matth.*16.19. *Whatsoever thou shalt bind &c.* One Minister may bind doctrinally, but one alone can not bind juridically.

Ninthly, the very doctrinall or concionall binding which is yeelded by Mr *Prynne*, is voyded and contradicted by the admission of known scandalous impenitent sinners to the Sacrament: for he that is admitted to the Sacrament is loosed, not bound; remission, not condemnation is supposed to be sealed up to him, as is manifest by the words of the Institution, *Matth.* 26.27,28. *Drinke ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sinnes.* So that without a power of binding by censures, and namely by suspension from the Sacrament, one and the same scandalous impenitent person shall be bound by the word, and loosed by the Sacrament. Surely he that is to be bound by the word, ought also to be bound by suspension from the Sacrament, unlesse we make one publique Ordinance to contradict another.

Tenthly, doth Mr *Prynne* believe that Jesus Christ hath any where given to Church-officers a forensicall or juridicall power of binding by Excommunication, and loosing by Absolution or receiving againe into the communion of the Church? If he doth believe it, then I aske where hath Christ committed that power unto them, if not *Matth.*18? If he doth not believe that Christ hath given any such power, then why doth he hold Excommunication to be lawfull and warrantable by the Word of God? Most certaine it is, that neither King, nor Parliament, nor Eldership, nor Synod, nor any power on earth, may or

ought to prohibite or keepe backe from the Sacrament such as Christ hath not commanded to be kept backe, or to bind sinners by Excommunication, if Christ hath given no such commission to bind in that kind.

Eleventhly, it may give us some light in this present Question, to compare the phrase of binding and loosing *Matth.* 18.19. with *Psalm* 149. 6,7,8,9. *Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged Sword in their hand, to execute vengeance upon the Heathen and punishments upon the people, To bind their Kings with chaines, and their Nobles with fetters of Iron, To execute upon them the judgement written: This honour have all his Saints.* Which both Jewish and Christian Interpreters referre to the Kingdome of Christ, out of whose mouth proceedeth a two-edged Sword, *Revel.* 1.16. & 2.12. ῥομφαία δίστομος, the phrase used in the Greeke version of *Psalm* 149. If it should be understood of temporall or externall victories and conquests of the Nations and their Kings, so it was not fulfilled to the Jews in the old Testament; and the Jewes doe now but in vaine flatter themselves with the expectation of such a thing to come. There are but two expositions which are most received and confirmed. The first is, that the Saints shall judge the world together with Christ 1 *Cor.* 6.2. and then vengeance shall be executed on the wicked, and all they who would not have Christ to reigne over them shall be bound hand and foot and cast into utter darknesse. This is the sence of *Arnobius* upon the place, and the Jesuits of *Doway*, *Emmanuel Sa*, *Jansenius*, *Lorinus*, *Menochius* goe that way. The other Exposition holds an accomplishment of the thing in this same world, and this in a Spirituall sence, concerning the Kingdome of Christ in this world, is holden by *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *VVestmeberus*, *Heshusius*, *Gesnerus*, *Fabritius*, and others. So the Dutch Annotations, *Augustine* and *Hierome*, both of them upon the place, take the sword, and the chaine, and fetters to be meant of the word of God conquering and overcomming aliens, and Hereticks, and the mightiest enemies; which others cleare from *Isa.* 45. 14. *Men of stature shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine, they shall come after thee, in chaines they shall come over.* But because the Psalmist maketh mention of a corrective or punitive judiciary

ciary power, therefore others adde for making the sence more full, the power of excommunication; for which *Lorinus* citeth *Bruno*, and *Hugo Victorinus*. Of the Protestant Interpreters upon the place, *Gesnerus*, applieth it to the power of the Keyes, to be made use of according to that which is written *Math.* 18. *Fabritius* conceiveth the Text to comprehend *castigationes spirituales*, and he citeth *Math.* 16. 19. *Math.* 18. 18. *Io.* 20. 23. *Hesshusius* cleareth it by the Instance of *Theodosius excommunicated by Ambrose*, Master *Cotton* in his *Keyes of the Kingdom of heaven* pag. 53. applyeth it to the Ecclesiasticall power of the Keyes. *Bartholomæus Coppen* understands it of the spirituall rule and Kingdom of Christ, and makes it paralell to 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. *the weapons of our warrefare are not carnall but mighty through God, to the pulling downe of strong holds*, vers. 6. *and having in readinesse to revenge all disobedience.* This judiciary Ecclesiasticall power is to be executed upon all such of the nations as fall under the Government of the Church according to the rule of Christ. And this honour have all his Saints, that their Ministers are armed with a power. They that follow this latter exposition will be easily induced to beleive that the binding and loosing *Mat.* 18. 19. is also judiciall or juridicall: They that follow the former exposition, will also observe that the phrase of binding in Scripture, even where it is ascribed to the Church or Saints, is used in a judiciary sence, and therefore it is most sutable to the Scripture phrase to understand *Mat.* 18, 19. in that sence.

As touching that other Exposition of the binding and loosing, that the object it is exercised about, is not a person, but a thing or Doctrine, for it is not said *Whomsoever* but *whatsoever ye bind:* It is sufficiently confuted by much of that which hath been said already, proving a forensicall binding and loosing even of persons. Onely I shall adde these further considerations. First, the binding and loosing are Acts of the power of the Keyes, and are exercised about the same object, about which the power of the Keyes is exercised *Math.* 16. 19. Now the power of the Keyes is exercised about persons, for the Kingdom of heaven is opened or shut to persons, not to Doctrines. If it be said that the Keyes are for opening and shutting, not for binding and loosing, to this I answer with *Alexr. Alensis part*

4. *Quæſt.* 20. *Membr.* 5. *that theſe Keyes are as well for binding and looſing as for ſhutting and opening; but the Act of binding and looſing doth agree to the Keyes immediately and in reſpect of the ſubject; but the act of opening in reference to the laſt end. Ibid. Membr.* 2. He had given this reaſon why the power of the Keyes is called the power of binding and looſing, *becauſe although to open and ſhut be the more proper Acts of the Keyes themſelves, yet neverthleſſe to looſe and bind are the more proper Acts in reference to thoſe who are to enter into the Kingdome, or to be excluded from the ſame; for the perſons themſelves which doe repent, are the ſubject of looſing: and they that repent not, of binding. Which is not ſo of opening and ſhutting; for although the opening be to thoſe that are looſed, and the ſhutting to thoſe that are bound; yet thoſe that are looſed are not the ſubject of opening (as to the manner of ſpeaking) nor thoſe that are bound, the Subject of ſhutting.* So then *antecedently* binding and looſing are Acts of the power of the Keyes, becauſe a man is bound before he be ſhut up, and looſed before the door be opened to him.

Secondly, that Gloſſe which now I deſpute againſt, doth ſuppoſe one of theſe two things: either that binding and looſing cannot be exerciſed upon the ſame object at different times, and that the binding is ſuch as can never be looſed againe; or otherwiſe that one and the ſame doctrine may be condemned at one time, and approved at another time. Both which are abſurd, and contrary to the generality of Divines.

Thirdly, ſeeing the Scripture ſpeaketh of binding and looſing in reference to perſons, as corporally, ſo ſpiritually, which I have before proved. Why then, ſhall perſons be excepted from being the object of binding and looſing *Matth.* 18?

Fourthly, that of binding and looſing *Mat.* 18. 18. doth cohere with and is added by occaſion of that which went before, as is alſo before proved. If this concerning the context be acknowledged, it will carry it to perſons; for it was an offending brother, not a falſe Doctrine, which was ſpoken of in the verſes precoding.

Fifthly, binding and looſing here doth at leaſt reach as farre as retaining or remitting of ſinnes *Io.* 20. 23. but there it is *Whoſoever ſinnes ye remit, &c.* They whoſe ſinnes are retained,

Wherefore

Wherefore ὅσα *whatsoever Mat.* 18. 18. is put for ὅσους *whomsoever*, by an *Hypallage generis*, many examples whereof may be given in Scripture: so τὰ ἴδια *Io.* 1. 11. is expounded by οἱ ἴδιοι: and *all things that offend* Mat. 13. 41. expounded by *them that doe iniquity*. Vnlesse you please to understand ὅσα ἁμαρτήματα, *whatsoever sinnes* ye bind upon men or loose from off them, they shall be bound upon them or loosed from off them in heaven.

CHAP. VII.

That 1 Cor. 5. *proveth Excommunication and (by a necessary consequence even from the Erastian Interpretation) Suspension from the Sacrament of a person unexcommunicated.*

MAster *Prynne* in his first *Quære* did aske whether that phrase 1 *Cor.* 5. *To deliver such a one to Sathan*, be properly meant of excommunication or suspension from the Sacrament onely. This, he saith, I did in my Sermon wave with a rhetoricall preterition. I answer for the latter part of the *Quære*, I know not the least ground, for who did ever expound it of suspension from the Sacrament onely? for the former part of it, its not necessary to be debated, therefore for husbanding time and not to multiply *Questions* unnecessarily, I said in my Sermon, that the Question ought to be whether that Chapter (not whether that phrase) prove excommunication; and that we have a shorter way to prove excommunication from the last words of that Chapter as Doctor *Moulin* doth in his *Vates lib.* 2. *cap.* 11. And if I should grant that delivering such a one to Sathan signifieth either of those things which Master *Prynne* conceiveth, that is, a bodily possession, torture, or vexation by Sathan, inflicted either by the apostolicall power of miracles, or by Gods immediate permission: yet that will not prove that it signifieth no more. Therefore *Peter Martyr* upon the place, thinks that the Apostles delivering of the man to Sathan by a miraculous act, and the Churches delivering of him to Sathan by Excommunication, doe very well stand together. So *Synop. pur. Theol. disp.* 48. *Thes.* 40 and he allow-

eth

eth of both theſe expoſitions; and afterward in his common place of excommunication he ſpeaketh of Gods cooperating with the Church cenſure, by puniſhing the Excommunicate perſon with diabolicall vexations. Sure I am an excommunicate perſon may truly be ſaid to be delivered to Sathan, who is the God and Prince of this world and reigneth in the Children of diſobedience. But Maſter *Prynne* will find himſelf difficulted to prove that *tradere Satanæ* 1 *Cor.* 5. is onely meant of a miraculous or extraordinary act, or to ſhew how or why the Apoſtle requireth the Aſſembling of the Church and their conſent to the working of a miracle. Which (if there were no more) may diſcover the weakneſſe of Maſter *Prynnes* notions concerning delivering to Sathan 6, 7, 8. But as the full debate were long, ſo it were not neceſſary, ſince Maſter *Prynne* doth now himſelf acknowledge that the laſt verſe of that Chapter proveth excommunication, *vindic. pag.* 2. I come therefore to the next, which he calls the fourth difference, whether 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *with ſuch an one no not to eat*, be properly meant of excommunication or ſuſpenſion from the Sacrament. But (whatſoever be properly meant by that phraſe) that which his debate driveth at, is, that this verſe doth neither prove excommunication nor ſuſpenſion from the Sacrament ſo much as by neceſſary conſequence.

But let us ſee whether his reaſons can weaken the proof of Suſpenſion from verſ. 11. firſt he ſaith there is not one ſyllable of receiving or eating of the Lords Supper in this Chapter. I anſwer, the queſtion is neither of ſyllables nor words but of things, and how will he prove that *verſ.* 8. *Let us keep the feaſt, not with old leavon, &c.* is not applicable to the Lords Supper, I ſay not to it onely, yet ſurely it cannot be excluded, but muſt needs becomprehended as one part, yea, a principall part of the meaning, the better to anſwer the Analogy of the paſſeover, (there much inſiſted upon.) He may be pleaſed alſo to remember that he himſelf pag. 24. proving the paſſeover and the Lords Supper to be the ſame for the ſubſtance, for proof hereof citeth 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. and that *Aretius Theol probl. loc.* 80. expoundeth our Feaſt of the Paſſeover 1 *Cor.* 5. to be meant of the Lords Supper.

But he further objecteth from 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. *We are all partakers*

partakers of that one Bread; if all were then partakers of this Bread, certainly none were excluded from it in the Church of Corinth; but at the Israelites under the Law, did all eat the same spirituall Meat, and all Drinke the same spirituall Drinke though God were displeased with many of them, who were Idolaters, tempters of God, fornicators, murmurers, and were destroyed in the wildernesse. 1 Cor. 10. 1. to 12. *so all under the Gospell who were visible members of the Church of Corinth, did eat and drink the Lords Supper to which some drunkards whiles drunken did then resort, as is clear by* 1 Cor. 11. 20. 21. *Which Paul indeed reprehends* vers. 22.

Answ. 1 When *Paul saith, we being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread,* he speaketh of the communion of Saints, & the word *all* can be of no larger extent then visible Saints, to whom the Epistle is directed 1 *Cor.* 1.2. and cannot be applyed to visible workers of iniquity, who continue impenitent and obstinate in so doing. As we may joyn in communion with a visible Church, which hath the externall markes of a Church, though it be not a true invisible Church; so we joyne with visible Saints to become one body with them in externall Church communion and to be partakers of one bread with them, though they be not true or invisible Saints in the hid man of the heart. But if these be visibly no Church, we cannot joyne in Church Communion; and if a man be visibly no Saint, he ought not to be admitted to the communion of Saints. I shall never be perswaded, that the Apostle *Paul* would say of himselfe and the Saints at *Corinth*, *We are one body with known Idolaters, Fornicators, Drunkards and the like.*

2 If all in the Church of *Corinth*, (none excluded) even drunkards whiles drunken, and if all under the Gospell who are visible members of the Church ought to be admitted to eat the same spirituall meat and drinke the same spirituall drink at the Lords Table, as he supposeth that in the wildernesse all the Israelites did the like, who were Idolaters, Fornicators, &c. Then I beseech you observe how Master *Prynne* doth by all this overthrow his owne rules; for pag. 2. and elsewhere he tells us he would have notorious scandalous sinners who after admonition persevere in their iniquities without remorse of conscience or amendment to be excommunicated from the Church and

from the society of the faithfull in all publike Ordinances? If both in the Church of Israel and in the Church of *Corinth*, all were admitted and none excluded, even those who were Idolaters or drunkards, whiles actually such without repentance or amendment; how can Master *Prynne* straiten Christians, now more then *Moses* did the Jewes, or *Paul* the *Corinthians?* Since therefore his Arguments drive at it, its best he should speak it out, that all manner of persons who professe themselves to be Christians, be they never so scandalous, never so obstinate, though they persevere in their iniquity after admonition without amendment, yet ought to be admitted to the Lords Table.

3 He shall never be able to prove either that those drunken persons 1 *Cor.* 11. 21. were drunken when they did resort to the Church, (for it was in the Church and in eating and drinking there, that they made themselves drunke) nor yet that the Idolaters and Fornicators in the wilderneſſe their eating of the spirituall meat and drinking of the spirituall drinke mentioned by the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 10. was after their Idolatries and Fornications: But of this latter, I have elsewhere spoken distinctly and by it self.

4 To say that all who were visible members of the Church of *Corinth* were admitted, and none excluded, and to say it with a *certainly* is to make too bold with Scripture. And the contrary will sooner be proved from 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. *ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devills: ye cannot be partakers of the Lords Table and of the Table of Devills.* So much for his first exception.

His second is concerning persons (but not to the purpose) that if we looke upon the catalogue of those with whom we are forbidden to eat, not onely shall most of the Anabaptisticall and Independent Congregations, but too many Presbyterian ministers and Elders, who are most foreward to excommunicate others for Idolatry, Fornication, Drunkenneſſe, must first be excommunicated themselves for their owne covetousneſſe. *Answ.* Let it light where it may, Ministers doe not stand nor fall to his Judgement: but where just proof can fasten either covetousneſſe or any other scandalous sinne upon them, its all the reason

son in the world they be censured with the first. If I had fallen upon this passage of his book without knowing the author, I had presently imagined it to be a peece from *Oxford*, it calls to my thoughts so many expressions in Pamphlets from thence, aspersing *London* and *Westminster*, as more full of covetousnesse, lying, hypocrisie, then *Oxford* of bloody Oathes, Masses and the like.

Thirdly, saith he, *it is as clear as the noone day sunne, that, no not to eat, in this Text is no more, then not to keep company, or hold civill familiarity with such.* What? as cleare as the noon day sun? let us open our eyes then to see this meridian light; first saith he, *no not to eat*, is interpreted in the Text it self by *not to keep company*, which we find twice in the preceding words, eating together being one of the highest expressions of outward friendship and familiarity. Had the Apostle said simply, *not to eat*, this Argument had been the more colourable, but after he had twice said, *not to keep company*, to adde *no not to eat*, (b) doth plainly intimate that the Apostle argueth from the lesse to the greater, and that there is some other fellowship and company with such a one, which is more than eating together and so much lesse permitted: and what is that? (eating together being as Master *Prynne* saith one of the highest expressions of outward friendship and familiarity.) Must it not be communion in the holy things, and especially the receiving such a one to the Lords Table? as if he had said, If scandalous brethren be spots in your common, how much more in your sacred Feasts? for which cause the mixture of scandalous persons in Church fellowship is extreamly blamed 2 *Pet.* 2. 13. *Iude v.* 12. Put case that a Parliament man or a Divine of the Assembly were known (as God forbid) to be an Incendiary, an active maligant, a traytor, a blasphemer, so that no raher Parliament man or Member of the Assembly would eat or company with him, were it not strange, if for all that such a one should be permitted to sit in Parliament or in Assembly? Is it not as strange if the whole Church distributively shall not so much as eat with a scandalous person, and yet the whole Church Collectively shall eat with him, in that very action which is a symbole of the communion of Saints? So that if I should now admit that sence, that these

(b) *Magdeb. Cent. 1 lib. 2. cap. 4. pag. 275. edit. 1624* giving the sence of this very place, they say. *Atq; ita excludantur a communione Ecclesiæ, ut non modo arceantur ab usu sacramentorum, sed etiam à commercio, ne cibus quidem cum iis capiatur.* *Novatius* upon the place expreseth the Apostles meaning in these words of *Ambrose*. *Cum fraire in quo vitia hæc reperiuntur, non solùm Sacramenta non edenda, sed nec communem escam docet, ut erubescat quum vitatur & se corrigat.*

words *no not to eat*, amount to no more then *not to keep company, or hold civill familiarity with such*, (as Mr. *Prynne* expresseth it) yet the Argument will stand firme and strong in regard of this necessary consequence. If a private Christian ought not to hold so much as civill fellowship with a scandalous brother not excommunicated, much lesse ought the Church to admit him to Church communion in all publike Ordinances; (there being lesse latitude, & the rule much stricter in this Communion than in private civill fellowship,) & if we be forbidden to do so much as to eat with such a one at a common meal, *quanto magis convictu sacro* saith *Pareus* upon the place, how much more is the Church forbidden to receive him to the Lords Table? for if the end of avoiding private company with such a one be to make him ashamed, as the Erastians themselves doe confesse from 2 *Thes.* 3. 14. were it not contrary to that end to countenance and embolden him by receiving him to publike Church communion at the Lords Table? Surely the refusing of the private could not so much put him to shame, as the admission to the publike should put respects upon him. Wherefore 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. as it is interpreted by Master *Prynne* proveth by a necessary consequence the Suspension from the Sacrament of a scandalous Church-Member not excommunicated.

If his next reason help him not, surely his sun will go down at noon, He citeth some paralell Texts, which interpret *not to eat* here, of avoiding them, turning away from and rejecting them, &c. which are no judiciall acts of the Prefbytery, but morall or prudentiall acts of particular Christians. *Answ.* There is a judiciall Presbyteriall act, (as very many conceive) in some of those paralell Texts cited by him 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. *Tit.* 3. 10. and so his proof is no lesse questionable, then the thing he would prove by it. And here the Apostle intendeth more then a voluntary prudentiall withdrawing of particular Christians, even a judiciall act, in the very next words, *What have I to doe to judge them also that are without? doe not ye judge them that are within?* where he gives the reason of what he had said before, that he had written to them not to be mixed with scandalous brethren, permitting them to keep company with Pagans though guity of the same faults. The reason, because Church-censurs

censures are onely for those that are Church-members not for aliens.

After Mr *Prynne* hath put forth his strength to prove that Excommunication or Suspension from the Sacrament is not meant 1 *Cor.*5.11. he comes in the next place to answer the argument drawn by consequence. If we may not so much as eate with such a one at our owne Tables, farre lesse at the Lords Table. Whereunto his answer is, The argument is fallacious, saith he, *because it varieth in the kinde of eating, the one being civill, the other spirituall; the one private in ones owne house, or anothers, where he hath absolute freedome or liberty to eate or not to eate with another, the other publike in the Church, &c.* But all this (say I) maketh our argument the stronger; for if it be sinne to a private man to eate in his owne house with a scandalous brother, though this be but a civill fellowship in which there is more liberty and lesse latitude than in religious fellowship; how much more sinfull is it for Church-officers to admit such a one to Sacramentall eating with the Church?

And for that first rule of his, that arguments from the lesse t the greater are not conclusive, except in the same kind of action, its utterly untrue. For the holy Scripture it selfe hath divers arguments from the lesse to the greater, where the kind is no lesse different, if not more, than private civill eating together is from publique eating together at the Table of the Lord, as *Numb.*12.14. If *Miriams* father had spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven daies? how much more when God hath smitten her with leprosie for speaking against his servant *Moses? Hag.*1.4. you have built to your selves ceiled houses, how much more ought ye to have built the house of the Lord? *Joh.*3.12. *If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of Heavenly things?* 1 Cor.6.3. *Know ye not that we shall judge Angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?*

His second exception is, that *they fall not both under the selfsame precept.* If this be a just exception against our argument, then one cannot argue thus, Its a sinne to steale a mans private goods, how much more to steale that which is holy? Its a sinne to reproach a mans name, how much more to reproach Gods Name? These doe not fall under the selfe-

same

same precept? shall such arguments be therefore inconcludent? Whence comes all this new logick which the world never knew before?

His third condition (let it be remembred he saith, if either of these three conditions faile, the argument is inconseqent) is, that it must be within the compasse of the same power. If it be so, how shall that hold universally true? *How much better is it to get wisdome then Gold? and to get understanding rather to be chosen then Silver?* By Mr *Prynnes* rule it must onely hold true in this case, when it fals within the compasse of the same power to get both Wisdome and Gold? However if he had apprehended our argument aright, he had perceived that the lesser thing, and the greater thing are both within the compasse of the same power. The Church of *Corinth* ought not to eate with such a one at common Tables: therefore not at the Lords Table. For this refusing to eate with such a one at common Tables, was by vertue of a judiciall Ecclesiasticall sentence passed against the scandalous person. So that when Mr *Prynne* saith *We have free power not to eate Bread with those at our own Tables, with whom we have no power or liberty left us by Christ, to refuse to eate with them at the Lords Table*, and thereupon supposeth that our argumentation from that Text is one principall cause and prop of Independency, yea of separation, not onely from Sacraments, but from Churches: he doth altogether misapprehend the businesse. For 1. Separation from Churches is properly a renouncing of membership as unlawfull: our argument concerneth the unlawfulnesse of a particular act, not of a membership in such a Church. 2. The causes and motives of separation suppose either an unlawfull constitution of Churches, or an unlawfull government of Churches, or both, so farre, that they who separate hold it unlawfnll to continue their membership in Churches so constituted and governed, or so much as to communicate and partake in the Sacrament with such Churches, though they know no scandalous person admitted to the Sacrament. 3. The great mistake lieth in this, that our present controversie is apprehended to be whether every particular Christian hath power or liberty from Christ to withdraw from the Sacrament, because of the admission of a scandalous person. Whereas our

Question

Question is onely of the Churches power to suspend a scandalous person from the Sacrament, and when the Apostle vers. 9. 10, 11. forbiddeth to be mixed or so much as to eate with such and such scandalous members of the Church, he meaneth of Church-discipline and Excommunication, which he had begun to speak of, and so he comes to shew them what kinde of persons c he would have to be excommunicated, and used like that incestuous man. So *Beza*, *Bullinger*, *Hunnius*, *Gualther*, *Martyr*, *Tossanus*, and others upon the place. And long before all these *Augustine* and *Beda* plainly expound the Apostles words of a publique Ecclesiasticall Judgement, past upon one who hath either confessed his offence or is formally accused and convict thereof; and as they conceive, that Text doth not at all justifie but doth rather condemne private Christians their separating from the Church, because of a mixture of scandalons persons. I know we ought prudently and cautiously to endeavour the avoyding of the company and fellowship of scandalous brethren, though not yet censured in the Church, (which may be proved from other Scriptures) but that is not the point the Apostle is here upon: he meanes by *no not to eate* synecdochically, the whole casting off of an excommunicate person, and all that separation or withdrawing which is commanded to be made from him, or if you will (by a metonimy of the effect for the cause) he meanes excommunication it selfe: and however, the words immediately following prove that a publique judiciall act is intended as hath been said before.

c *Gualther ar-chel. in 1 Cor. 5. 11.* Catalogus eorum qui debent excommunicari. *Tossanus ibid.* Quod cibum non vult sumi cum iis, pertinet id quidem ad disciplinam excommunicationis. *Martyr ibid.* Notandum præterea, non esse privatorum hominum ut quisque pro sua libidine ab hoc vel ab illo, quem peccasse fortè suspicatus fuerit, sese disjungere velit. Ad commune judicium Ecclesiæ pertinet. *August. Hom. 50* joyneth 1 *Cor.* 5. v. 11. with v. 12, 13. and then saith, *Quibus verbis satis ostendit non temerè aut quomodolibet, sed per judicium auferendos esse malos ab Ecclesiæ communione, ut si per judicium auferri non possunt, tolerentur potius, ne perverse malos quisque evitando, ab Ecclesia ipse discedens, eos quos fugere videtur vincat ad gehennam.* The same hath *Beda* upon the place out of *Augustine*. So likewise *Ambrose* and the Centurists before cited,

These things considered, I shall not need to be led out of my way by Mr *Prynnes* descanting upon the meaning of 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. how farre it prohibits civill communion and eating with a scandalous Christian, being a railer or fornicator or Idolater, &c. I confesse some of his limitations, as namely, that we may eate with such a one in cases of expediency or when we can not avoyd it in civility nor without offence, are very lubricke, unsafe,

safe, and ensnaring, and at best its but like that in *Martials* Epigramme

Difficilis, facilis, jucundus, acerbus es idem;
Nec tecum possum vivere, nec sine te.

But to treat of that case of conscience in generall is not *hujus loci*; for this Text speaks of not eating with an excommunicate person. Neither yet shall I need here to examine Mr *Prynnes* six considerations p. 12, 13, 14. which he wisheth to be pondered by Separatists and Independents misled, (as he thinks) by our fallacious argument: I hope he doth not mistake our Question so farre as to comprehend the sinfulnesse of any private Christian his receiving of the Sacrament, when and where some scandalous sinners are admitted to the Sacrament, that private Christian not being accessary to the sinne of the Minister and Eldership in admitting those scandalous sinners.

Wherefore I will adde eight counterballancing considerations to prove from 1 *Cor.* 5.* the first twelve verses thereof (all which Mr *Prynne* conceiveth can not prove Excommunication) compared with 2 *Cor.*2. an Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction or power of censures, and particularly of Excommunication.

* The 13 verse he yeeldeth to be a warrant for Excommunication: yet he differeth concerning that also, in *Diotrephes catechised.*

1. There was a censure inflicted upon the incestuous man by the Eldership of the Church of *Corinth*, being assembled together 1 *Cor.*5.4,5. Where read we that ever the Church was intentionally gathered together, to cooperate with an Apostle in the exercise of his miraculous apostolicall power? But we doe read that this mans punishment or censure was inflicted upon him not by the Apostle alone but by *Many*, 2 *Cor.*2.6. *Erastus* pag. 214. thinks that ἐπιτιμία (in our bookes rendered punishment, and in the margent censure) was not excommunication, but onely sharpe objurgation or reproofe. To this I have abundantly answered *Book 2. chap. 9.* and in *Male audis* pag. 12, 13, 14. And if it should be granted that the man was not then excommunicate but sharply and publiquely rebuked (which indeed is the opinion of some) yet the Church of *Corinth* had proceeded to excommunication, had not written to dissuade them, if the Apostle and take them off with a *Sufficit*, which he neither needed nor would have done, if they had power to doe no more to the offender then to rebuke him sharply. To conclude this point,

point,M *Prynne* granteth that 1 *Cor.*5.13.proveth excommunication; and why the gathering together, verſ.4. ſhould not be intended for the ſame worke, I cannot imagine? Some queſtion there was of old whether the Apoſtles meaning verſ. 13. were not that the *Corinthians* ſhould put away every man out of himſelfe the evill of ſinne. Which *Auguſtine* having ſomewhere left *in medio*, doth in his Retractations correct, (and *Beda* upon the place out of him tels us the very ſame) and expound it of the taking away of the evill man from the Church by Excommunication, becauſe ſaith he, the Greeke can not be rendered *hoc malum*, but *hunc malum*.

2. They who had power to receive him and forgive him, and to confirme their love towards him, had power to caſt him out and cenſure him; but thoſe πλείονες, the Church officers of the Church of *Corinth* had power of the former; Therefore of the latter. See 2 *Cor.*2.7,8. The Apoſtle adviſeth them to forgive the offender. How to forgive him? not as man forgives a private injury: that was not the caſe. Nor onely by the doctrine of remiſſion of ſinnes applied to him *in foro conſcientiæ*, upon evidence of his repentance: that any one Miniſter might doe. But the Apoſtle will have thoſe *many* who had cenſured him conſiſtorially and judicially, to forgive him in the ſame manner. Which is yet further confirmed by that κύρωσις τῆς ἀγάπης, that confirming of their love towards him verſ. 8. κυρῶσαι is *ratum facere*, thence commeth not onely κύρωσις but κύρωσις. When the Apoſtle will expreſſe a ratified or confirmed teſtament *Galat.* 3.15.he cals it κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην. From the ſame word *Eraſmus* doth collect that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh to them as the ordinary Judges who have power to confirme their love to that penitent ſinner in an authoritative manner. And why doth the Apoſtle chooſe a word which properly ſignifieth an authoritative confirming or ratifying of a thing, if he were not ſpeaking of a juriſdiction and power of inflicting and taking off againe cenſures?

3. The Apoſtle upon occaſion of that offenders caſe, puts the *Corinthians* in remembrance, that they ought likewiſe to purge the Church from the mixture of other ſcandalous ſinners, 1 *Cor.* 5.9,10,11,12. The Chapter both begins and ends with

the case of the incestuous man and his punishment; which makes interpreters conceive, that what is enterlaced concerning other scandalous sinners in the Church, is to be understood of such as the Apostle would have to be censured in the same manner as that incestuous man.

4. He instanceth in six cases, (not intending an enumeration of all the particular cases of Excommunication) fornication, covetousnesse, (meaning covetousnesse scandalously and grossely manifested, or practicall covetousnesse, for of the heart God onely judgeth) idolatry, railing, drunkennesse, extortion. His instancing in these, tels us he intends not the case of private civill injuries, but of scandals, yea though the scandall be without the mixture of any civill or private injury, as in the case of an Idolater or a drunkard.

5. And even where there is a private injury wrapt up in the bosome of the scandall, as in railing and extortion, yet the Apostle there looketh upon them not *qua* injuries, but *qua* scandals; and in that notion, he will have not onely the party particularly interrested and injured, but the other members of the Church also to withdraw communion from the offender; for he writeth to the whole Church of *Corinth*, not to keepe company with such.

6. When he saith, *with such a one no not to eate*, he intimates by *No not* some further and greater punishment than not eating with him, as hath been said before: If not so much as eating with him, then muchlesse Church communion with him at the Lords Table.

7. He meanes not of that withdrawing whereby each Christian may and ought to withdraw familiarity and fellowship from such a notorious scandalous sinner, whose sinne is manifest before hand, that he may keep himselfe pure, and not partake of another mans sinne: In which case a member of one Church may withdraw familiar conversing with a scandalous member of another Church. But he speakes of such a withdrawing from and avoyding of the fellowship of a scandalous Brother, as is done not by one or some few private Christians, but by the whole Church (for hee writeth to the whole Church of *Corinth*, not to company nor eate with

with such a one) I say, by the whole Church, whereof the offender was a member: and that not without a judiciall or consistoriall sentence, vers. 12. *Doe not ye judge them that are within?* which can not be restricted to the judgement of Christian discretion and prudence (for so both the Apostles and they did judge those that were without, to walke circumspectly toward them, *Col.*4.5. and to beware of their evill.) But tis meant of censures and punishments inflicted by many, that is, by the Presbyters of that Church, 2 *Cor.*2.6.

8. And so I have touched upon the last consideration, which is this. That as the fault was a scandall given to the Church, and the judgement and censure was Ecclesiasticall, not civill, so that censure for that offence was inflicted onely upon Church members, not upon unbelievers. If an unbeliever did a civill injury to a Christian, the Christian was free to accuse the unbeliever (if he saw it good) before the civill Magistrate, and there to seeke judgement and justice. Or the Christian was free to withdraw civill fellowship from the unbeliever, which did him a civill injury, which I suppose Mr *Prynne* will easily grant. But this way of censuring and punishing a scandalous Church member, did not agree to an Heathen who was an Idolater, or drunkard, or extortioner, &c. Vers. 10,11,12,13. Thus I have proved Church censure from 1 *Cor.*5. compared with 2 *Cor.*2. without laying the weight of any argument upon *Tradere Sathanæ.* Which I would not have to be understood, as if I yeelded to our opposites, that the delivering to Satan is not meant of Excommunication. My meaning is onely to make the shorter worke of the Erastian *Antithesis.* The weight of their arguments, not of ours, is laid upon *Tradere Sathanæ.* But for my sence of the word, I am of their opinion who interpret it of Excommunication; and so doth *Gualther* himselfe. So doth the Syriack, which readeth, *That you* (Corinthians) *may deliver such a one to Satan.* If it was an an act of the Church of *Corinth*, then it was a Church censure, not a miracle. The Greeke doth also carry it to be an act of the Church of *Corinth* assembled together. We have also some (though not all) of the Ancients for us in this particular: as *Balsamon in Canon. epist. Basilii ad Amphiloch. Can.*7. observeth. *Basil* speaketh of some who at

that time had been delivered to Satan for 30 yeeres, that they might learn not to carry thnmselves filthily, yea unnaturally, as they had done formerly: concerning whom he adviseth that now after so long a time, they might be (upon their spontaneous confession of their hainous offence) received againe into the Church. Hereupon *Balsamonn* oteth, *Those are said to be delivered to Satan, who are separated from the communion of Christians.*

Chap. VIII.

Whether Judas *received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.*

Mr. *Prynne* hath filled up a good part of his *Vindication* with the case of *Judas*, as going very farre in the deciding of this present contoversie. But as Protestant writers answer the Papists in the case of *Peter*, that it cannot be proved that *Peter* was ever Bishop of *Rome*, but rather that he was not; and if he had, this cannot prove the Popes Supremacy: the like I say of this case of *Judas*. M. *Prynne* shall never be able to prove that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: and if he could prove it, yet it shall not at all helpe that cause which he maintaineth.

I begin with the matter of fact, whether *Judas* received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, as well as the other Apostles, which is the question by him stated. For decision whereof, I hold it necessary, first of all that these two things be premised, concerning the harmony of the Evangelists in that matter of *Judas*, the use whereof we shall see afterwards. *Matthew* and *Marke* tell us Christs discourse of the Traytor at Table, and the discovery of *Judas*, before the institution of the Sacrament. *Luke* hath the same thing after the institution and distribution of the Sacrament. So that either *Matthew* and *Marke* speak by
// anticipation, or *Luke* speaketh by a recapitulation; that is, ei-
// ther *Matthew* and *Marke* put before what was done after, or

Luke

Luke puts after what was done before. Now that there is in *Luke* an ὑστερολογία, a narration of that after the institution which was indeed before the institution of the Sacrament, may thus appeare. 1. That very thing which *Luke* placeth after the institution and distribution of the Sacrament, *Luk.*22.21,22,23. *Behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table. And truly the sonne of man goeth as it was determined, but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed. And they began to enquire among themselves which of them it was that should doe this thing.* The very same thing doe *Matthew* and *Marke* record before the institution of the Sacrament, *Matth.*26.21. to 26. *Marke* 14. 18. to 22. and it is more credible that one of the Evangelists is to be reduced to the order of two, rather than two to the order of one.

2. Especially considering that *Luke* doth not relate the businesse of the last supper according to that order wherein things were acted or spoken, as is manifest by *Luke* 22.17.18. *And he tooke the cup and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among your selves.* This though related before the taking and breaking of the bread, yet it is but by an anticipation or preoccupation, occasioned by that which had preceded vers. 16. so to joyne the protestation of not drinking againe, with that of not eating againe the Passeover with his Disciples: therefore *Beza, Salmeron, Maldonat,* and others following *Augustine* and *Euthymius* doe resolve it is an anticipation, even as *Paul* mentioneth the cup before the bread, 1 *Cor.*10.16. *I* know some understand the cup mentioned *Luke* 22. 17. to be the Paschall cup; others, to be the cup in the ordinary supper; but to me its plaine that it was the Eucharisticall cup; yea Mr *Prynne* takes it so pag. 25. because that which *Luke* saith of that cup, that Christ tooke it, and gave thankes, and gave it to the Disciples, that they might all drinke of it, and told them he would not drinke with them any more of the fruit of the Vine till the Kingdome of God should come; all this is the very same which *Matthew* and *Marke* record of the Eucharisticall cup. Therefore our Non-conformists were wont to argue from that place, that the Minister ought not to give the Sacramentall elements to each communicant out of his owne hand, but that the communicants

municants ought to divide the elements among themselves, because Christ saith in that place, of the cup, *Divide it among your selves.*

3. *Luke* saith not that after Supper, or after they had done with the Sacrament, Christ told his Disciples that one of them should betray him; onely he addeth, after the History of the Sacrament, what Christ said concerning the Traytor. But *Matthew* and *Marke* doe not onely record Christs words concerning the Traytor before they make narration concerning the Sacrament, but they record expressly that that discourse and the discovery of the Traytor was ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, *as they did eate, Matth.26.21. Marke* 14. 18. *Now when the evening was come he sate down with the twelve*, and immediately followeth, as the first purpose which Christ spake of, *and as they did eate, he said, verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.* Which could not be so, if *Luke* relate Christs words concerning the Traytor in that order in which they were first uttered; for *Luke* having told us verse 22. that Christ tooke the cup after Supper and said, *This cup is the new Testament, &c.* addeth, *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table.* So that if this were the true order, Christ did not tell his Disciples concerning the Traytor, as they did eate (which *Matthew* and *Marke* doe say) but after they had done eating. If it be said that ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν may suffer this sence, when they had eaten, or having eaten. I answer, the context will not suffer that sence; for they were indeed eating in the time of that discourse, *Matth.26.23. He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish the same shall betray me*, Jos.13.26. *He it is to whom I shall give a sop after I have dipped it.*

4. *Musculus in loc. com. de cæn. dom. pag.* 362. gives this reason out of *Rupertus*, why *Lukes* narration of Christs words concerning the Traytor, is placed by a recapitulation after the Sacrament: because *Luke* is the onely Evangelist who writeth distinctly of the Paschall Supper, and what Christ said at that Supper: and having once fallen upon that purpose, the connexion of the matter did require that he should immediately adde the story of the Eucharisticall Supper, without interlacing that of the Traytor. Which reason will passe for good with

with such as think *Judas* did eate of the Paschall Supper, and that Christs words concerning him were spoken at the Paschall Supper, which I greatly doubt of.

5. Mr *Prynne* pag. 18. doth in effect grant the same thing that I say; for he saith, *that Matthew and Marke record that immediatly before the institution of the Sacrament, as they sate at meat Jesus said unto the twelve, Verily one of you shall betray me, whereupon they began to be sorrowfull and to say unto him, &c.* He addeth, that *Judas* was *the last man that said, Is it I? immediately before the institution*, as *Matthew records*. But of *Luke* he saith onely thus much, that he *placeth these words of Christ concerning Judas his betraying him, after the institution and distribution of the Sacrament, not before it.* If it be thus as Mr *Prynne* acknowledgeth, that *Matthew* and *Marke* record, that Christ had that discourse concerning *Judas* before the institution of the Sacrament, then most certainly it was before the institution of the Sacrament, because it must needs be true which *Matthew* and *Marke* say. Whence it will necessarily follow that *Luke* doth not mention that discourse concerning *Judas* in its proper place, and this doth not offer the least violence to the Text in *Luke*, because he doth not say that Christ spake these words after the Sacrament, onely he placeth these words after the Sacrament, as Mr *Prynne* saith rightly. When Scripture saith that such a thing was done at such a time, it must be so believed. But when Scripture mentioneth one thing after another, that will not prove that the thing last mentioned was last done. More plainly Master *Prynne* pag. 26,27. tels us that the Sacrament was given after Christ had particularly informed his Disciples that one of them should betray him, which he proves from *Joh.* 13.18. to 28. *Matth.* 26.20. to 36. *Marke* 14.18. to 22. *Luke* 22.21,22,23. Whence it follows inevitably by his owne confession, that *Matthew* and *Marke* recording that discourse about *Judas* ~~after~~ before the Sacrament, doe place it in the proper order; and that *Luke* mentioning that discourse about *Judas* after the Sacrament, doth not place it in its owne place. This is the first thing which I thought good to premise, which will easily take off the strongest argument which ever I heard alledged for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament, namely this, that *Luke* immediately

diately after the institution and distribution of the Sacrament addeth, *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me at the Table.* If these words were not uttered by Christ in that order wherein *Luke* placeth them (which I have proved) then the argument is not conclusive.

The second thing to be premised, is this: that the story which we have *Joh* 13. from the beginning to verse 31. concerning the Supper at which Christ discoursed of *Judas* and gave him the sop, after which he went immediately out, was neither in *Bethany* two daies before the Passeover, as the *Antidote Animadverted* tels us pag. 5. nor yet after the institution of the Sacrament, as Mr *Prynne* tels us, *Vindic.* pag. 25. herein differing either from himselfe or his friend. That Supper in *Bethany*, the Pamphlet saith, was two daies before the Passeover; but some Interpreters collect from *John* 12.1,2. it was longer before; Christ having come to *Bethany* six daies before, and after that Supper the next day Christ did ride into *Jerusalem* on a young Asse, and the people cried *Hosanna*, *Joh.* 12.12. the very story which we have *Matth.* 21. *Marke* saith that two daies before the Passeover the chiefe Priests and Scribes sought how to put Christ to death, but he doth not say that the Supper in *Bethany* was two daies before the Passeover. But of this I will not contend, whenever it was, it is not much materiall to the present question, there was nothing at that Supper concerning *Judas*, but a rebuking of him for having indignation at the spending of the Alabaster box of Oyntment, and from that he sought opportunity to betray Christ: But the discourse between Christ and his Apostles concerning one of them that should betray him, and their asking him one by one *Is it I?* was in the very night of the Passeover, as is cleare *Matth.* 26.19,20, to 26. *Marke* 14.16, to 22. So that the story *Joh.* 13.18. to 30. being the same with that in *Matthew* and *Marke*, could not be two daies before the Passeover. And if two daies before Christ had discovered to *John* who should betray him, by giving the sop to *Judas*, how could every one of the Disciples (and so *John* among the rest) be ignorant of it two daies after, which made every one of them to aske *Is it I?* Finally, that very night in which the Lord Jesus did institue the Sacrament, the Disciples began

began to be sorrowfull, and began to enquire which of them it was that should betray him, *Matth.*26.22. *Marke* 14.19. *Luke* 22.23. But if Christ had told them two daies before that one of themselves who did sit at Table with him should betray him, surely they had not at that time begun to be sorrowfull and to aske every one *Is it I?*

That which hath been said doth also discover that other mistake that the discourse at Table concerning the Traytor, and the giving of the sop to *Judas Joh.*13. was after the institution of the Sacrament. If it were after, then either that in *John* is not the same with the discourse concerning the Traytor mentioned by *Matthew* and *Marke*; or otherwise *Matthew* and *Marke* speake by anticipation. But I have proved both that the true order is in *Matthew* and *Marke*, and that the discourse concerning the Traytor mentioned by *John* must be in the Evangelicall harmony put together with that in *Matthew* and *Marke*, as making one and the same story. And if this in *John* had been posterior to that in *Matthew*, then why doth Mr *Prynne* himselfe joyn these together as one, pag.18,19.

These things premised, I come to the arguments which prove that *Judas* did not receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

The first argument (which was by me touched in that Sermon so much quarrelled by Mr *Prynne*) is this. It is said of *Judas*, *Ioh.*13.30. *He then having received the sop went immediatly out.* But this sop or morsell was given him before the Sacrament, whiles they were yet eating the other Supper, at the end whereof Christ did institute the Sacrament. Therefore *Judas* went away before the Sacrament. Let us heare Mr *Prynnes* four answers to this argument, pag.24,25. First, saith he, *Judas* went not out till after Supper, *John* 13.2. *and Supper being ended, &c.* Answ. δείπνου γενομένου will not prove that the Supper was fully ended. The Centurists *Gent.*1.*lib.*1.*cap.*10. explaine *Iohn* 13.2. thus, *Magnâ cænæ hujus parte peractâ, A great part of this Supper being done*; yea the Greek may be as well turned thus, *When they were at Supper*, as the late English Annotations have it. *Ludovicus de Dieu* chooseth this sence. *Salmeron* and others proue it from verse 4. *He riseth from Supper*, with vers.12.

he sate down againe to Supper, and dipped the sop. Take but two like instances in this same story of the passion, *Matth.26. 6.* τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ *Now when Jesus was in Bethany*, not, *after Jesus was in Bethany. Matth.26 20.* Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης *Now when the even was come*, not, *when the even was ended.* His second answer, that all the other three Evangelists prove that *Judas* was present at the Sacrament, is but *petitio principii.* Thirdly (saith he) the Sacrament was not instituted after Supper, but as they sat at Supper. *Answ.* It was indeed instituted while they were sitting at supper, or before they rose from supper, so that they were still continuing in a Table gesture; yet the actions must needs be distinguished, for they did not at the same instant receive the Sacrament, and eate of another supper too. And though it be said of the bread, that *as they did eate, Iesus tooke bread*, yet of the cup *Paul* and *Luke* say, that Jesus tooke it *after Supper*, that is, after they had done eating; therefore certainly after *Iudas* got the sop and went away, at which instant they had not done eating. Neither is there any ground at all *Luke* 22. 17. to prove that he tooke the cup during supper, as Mr *Prynne* conceiveth. But finding no strength herein, he addeth: that some learned men are of opinion that Christ had that night *first his paschall supper, at the close whereof he instituted his own Supper. Secondly, an ordinary supper which succeeded the institution of his own, in imitation whereof the Corinthians and Primitive Christians had their love feasts, which they did eat immediately after the Lords Supper: and this is more then intimated Iohn 13. v. 2, 12, to 31, &c. therefore Lukes after Supper he tooke the cup, must be meant onely after the Paschall supper, not the other Supper.*

1. Cor. 11. 21, 22.
Tertul. apolog.

Answ. I verily believe that beside the Paschall and Eucharisticall suppers, Christ and his Disciples had that night a common or ordinary supper, and so think *Calvin* and *Beza* upon *Matth.26.20. Pareus* upon *Matth.26.21. Fulk* on 1 *Cor.11.23. Cartwright ibid.* and in his Harmony *lib.3.* pag. 173. *Pelargus* in *Iob. 13. quæst. 2. Tossanus* in *Matth. 26. Tolet* and *Maldonat* upon *Iohn 13. 2. Iansenius conc. evang.* cap. 131. and divers others. I am very glad that Mr *Prynne* grants it; and I approve his reason, that in the Paschall supper we read of no sops,

nor

nor ought to dip them in. The Jewes indeed tell us of a ſauce in the Paſſeover which they call *Charoſeth:* but I ſuppoſe Chriſt kept the Paſſeover according to the Law, and did not tie himſelfe to rites which had come in by tradition. I could bring other reaſons to prove an ordinary ſupper, if it were here neceſſary. But what gaineth Mr *Prynne* hereby? ſurely he loſeth much, as ſhall appeare afterwards.

2. Whereas he thinks the common ſupper at which Chriſt did waſh his Diſciples feet, and diſcover *Iudas*, and give him the ſop, was after the Sacrament, as I know not thoſe learned men that thinke as he doth in this point, ſo it is more than he can prove. The contrary hath been proved from *Matthew* and *Marke* who record that the diſcourſe concerning *Iudas* was while they were eating that ſupper which preceded the Sacrament; ſo that the giving of the ſop to *Iudas* muſt be before the Sacrament. But after the Sacrament both *Matthew* and *Marke* doe immediately adde, *and when they had ſung a hymne they went out into the mount of Olives.*

3. As for that of the *Corinthians*, the very place cited by himſelfe maketh againſt him, 1 *Cor.* 11. 21. for when they came together to eate the Lords Supper, every one did προλαμβάνειν firſt take his owne ſupper, and that in imitation of Chriſt who gave the Sacrament after ſupper. So *Aquinas*, *Lyra*, and others following *Auguſtine*. This taking firſt or before, [d] hath reference to the Sacrament; becauſe it is ſpoken of every one who came to the Lords Table, *every one taketh before his owne ſupper*, which made ſuch a diſparity that one was hungry and another drunken at the Sacrament, the poore having too little, and the rich too much at their owne ſupper.

[d] *Migdeb. cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 6. cap. 384. edit. 1624.* apud Corinthios invaluerat ille abuſus, ut ante cænam Dominicam inter ſe concertarent; & alii ibi ſuas cœnas inſtruerent & benepoti cænam Domini acciperent.

4. The example of the ancient Chriſtians will helpe him as little. I finde no ſuch thing in *Tertullians Apologetik*, as the eating of the love feaſts immediately after the Lords Supper. But I finde both in the [e] African Canons and in [f] *Auguſtine*, and

[e] *Cod. canon. eccl. Afric. can.* 41. Ut Sacramenta altaris non niſi à jejunis hominibus celebrentur, excepto uno die anniverſario, quo cæna dominica celebratur. [f] *Auguſt. epiſt.* 118. *cap.* 7. Sed nonnullos probabilis quædam ratio delectavit, ut uno certo die per annum quo ipſam cænam Dominus dedit, tanquam ad inſigniorem commemorationem, poſt cibos offerri & accipi liceat corpus & ſanguinem Domini &c. hoc tamen non arbitror inſtitutum, niſi quia plures & propè omnes in pleriſque locis eo die cænare conſueverunt.

Iudas being mightily irritated and exasperated both by the sop, and by Christs answer, (for when *Iudas* asked *Is it I?* Christ answered *Thou hast said*) would certainly breake away abruptly and very immediately. So much of the first argument.

The second argument (which I also touched in my Sermon) was this. As Christ said to the Communicants, *Drinke ye all of it, Matth.26.27. and they all dranke, Matth.14.23.* so he saith to them all, *This is my Body which is broken for you, This is the cup of the new covenant in my Blood, which is shed for you, Luke 22. 19,20.* But if *Iudas* had been one of the communicants, it is not credible that Christ would have said so in reference to him, as well as to the other Apostles. This argument Mr *Prynne* p.25. doth quite mistake, as if the strength of it lay in a supposed particular application of the words of the institution to each communicant, which I never meant, but dislike it as much as he: The words were directed to all, in the plurall. *This is my Body broken for you, &c. my Blood shed for you, &c.* Mr *Prynne* conceives that it might have been said to *Iudas*, being meant by Christ, *onely conditionally, that his Body was broken, and his Blood was shed for him, if he would really receive them by faith. Ionas Schlichtingius a* Socinian in his booke against *Meisnerus* pag. 803. though he supposeth as Mr *Prynne* doth that *Iudas* was present at the giving of the Sacrament, yet he holds that it is not to be imagined, that Christ would have said to *Iudas*, that his body was broken for him. And shall we then who believe that the death of Jesus Christ was a satisfaction to the justice of God for sinne (which the Socinians believe not) admit that Christ meant to comprehend *Iudas* among others, when he said *this is my body which is broken for you?*

Ministers doe indeed offer Christ to all upon condition of believing, being commanded to preach the Gospell to every creature, and not knowing who are reprobates: but that Christ himselfe (knowing that the sonne of perdition was now lost, that the Scripture might be fulfilled *Iohn* 17.12.) would in the Sacrament (which is more applicative then the word, and particularizeth the promises to the receivers) so speake, as that in any sence those words might be applied to *Iudas*, that even for him

him his body was broken and his blood shed; and that thereupon the seales should be given him, to me is not at all credible; and I prove the negative by foure arguments: (though I might give many more) 1. If Christ did in reference to *Judas* meane conditionally that his body was broken, and his blood shed for him, if he would believe (as Mr *Prynne* holds) then he meant conditionally to save the sonne of perdition whom he knew infallibly to be lost, and that he should be certainly damned and goe to Hell, and that in eating the Sacrament he would certainly eate and drinke judgement to himselfe (all which Mr *Prynne* himselfe pag. 26. saith Christ infallibly knew) But who dare thinke or say so of Jesus Christ? Suppose a Minister knew infallibly that such a one hath blasphemed against the holy Ghost, (which sinne the Centurists and others thinke to have been committed by *Judas*, which could not be hid from Christ) and is irrecoverably lost, and will be most certainly damned, durst that Minister admit that person to the Sacrament, and make those words applicable to him so much as conditionally; *This is the Lords body broken for you: This is the blood of the new Covenant shed for you unto remission of sinne?* How much lesse would Christ himselfe say so, or mean so in reference to *Judas?*

2. If Christ would not pray for *Judas*, but for his elect Apostles onely, and such as should believe through the word of the Gospell; then he meant not so much as conditionally to give his body and blood for *Judas*. (for if he meant any good to *Judas*, so much as conditionally, he would not have excluded him from having any part at all in his prayers to God.) But Christ doth exclude *Judas* from his prayer, *Iohn* 17. not onely as one of the reprobate world vers. 9. but even by name vers. 12. giving him over for lost, and one that was not to be prayed for.

3. Love and hatred in God and in his sonne Jesus Christ, being eternall and unchangeable, (for *actus Dei immanentes sunt æterni*) it followeth that if there was such a decree of God, or any such meaning or intention in Christ, as to give his body and blood for *Judas*, whom he knew infallibly to be lost: and since that same conditionall meaning or intention could

not

not be without a conditionall love of God and of Christ to *Judas* and his salvation: this love doth still continue in God, and in Christ, to save *Judas* now in Hell upon condition of his believing, which every Christian I thinke will abominate.

4. That conditionall love and conditionall intention or meaning, could not have place in the Sonne of God. For as *Spanhemius* doth rightly argue in his late learned Exercitations *de gratia universali* pag. 746. it doth not become either the wisdome or goodnesse of God to will and intend a thing upon such a condition as neither is nor can be. And pag. 829. he saith, that this conditionall destination or intention cannot be conceived, as being incident onely to such as doe neither foreknow nor direct and order the event, and in whose hand it is not to give the faculty and will of performing the thing. Which can not without impiety be thought or said of God. Thus he.

The third argument (which I shall now adde) is that whereby *Hilarius Can.* 30. *in Matth.* and *Innocentius* the third *lib.* 4. *de mysterio miss. cap.* 13. prove that *Iudas* received not the Sacrament, neither was present at the receiving of it. Because that night while *Iudas* was present, Christ in his gracious and comfortable expressions to his Apostles did make an exception, as *Iohn* 13.10,11. *Ye are cleane, but not all. For he knew who should betray him, therefore said he, ye are not all cleane,* vers. 18. *I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen.* So vers. 21. even as before Joh. 6.70. *Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a divell.* But at the Sacrament all his sweet and gracious speeches are without any such exception, *This is my body which is given for you, &c.* Yea he saith positively of all the Apostles to whom he gave the Sacrament, *I will not drinke henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, untill that day when I drinke it new* **with you** *in my Fathers Kingdome, Matth.* 26.29. and this he saith nnto them all, as it is cleare from vers. 27. *Drinke ye all of it.* Againe, *Luke* 22.28,29,30. *Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptatoons. And I appoint unto you a Kingdome as my Father hath appointed unto me. That ye may eate and drinke at my Table in my Kingdome, and sit on Thrones judging the twelve Tribes*

of

of Israel. Would not Christ much more have excepted *Iudas* in these expressions, if he had been present, seeing he had so often excepted him before?

As for Mr *Prynnes* reasons from Scripture to prove that *Iudas* did receive the Sacrament, they are extreamely inconcludent. First, he saith, that *Matthew*, *Marke*, and *Luke*, are all expresse *in terminis*, that Christ sate down to eate the Passeover, and the twelve Apostles with him; that *Iudas* was one of those twelve, and present at the Table; that as they sate at meat together, Jesus tooke Bread, &c. that he said of the cup, drinke ye all of it; and *Marke* saith they all dranke of it.

Answ. 1. The three Evangelists are all expresse *in terminis*, that when Even was come, Christ sate down with the twelve; as likewise that the twelve did eate with him that night; but that the twelve Apostles were with him in the eating of the Passeover, they are not expresse *in terminis*, and I have some reasons which move me to thinke that *Iudas* did not eate so much as of the Passeover that night: whereof in the proper place. 2. And if he had been at the Passeover, that proves not he was at the Lords Supper. When Christ tooke the cup and said, *Drink ye all of it*, it was after supper, that is, after the Paschall supper, as Mr *Prynne* himselfe gives the sence. 3. When *Marke* saith, *They all dranke of it*, he means all that were present, but *Iudas* was gone forth. His argument supposeth that *Iudas* was present, which being before disproved, there remaines no more strength nor life in his argument.

That which he addeth pag. 18, 19. if it have either strength or good sence, I confesse the dulnesse of my conception. He would prove from *Matthew* and *Marke* that immediately before the institution of the Sacrament, Christ told his Disciples that one of them should betray him, and they all asked *Is it I?* and that therefore certainly the Sacrament was given to *Iudas*, because he was the last man that said *Is it I?* immediately before the institution. And further (saith he) *Luke* placeth these words of Christ concerning *Iudas* his betraying of him, after the institution, which manifesteth that *Iudas* was present at the Sacrament. His inference is this, that seeing *Iohn* averreth, Chap. 13. v. 2. that all this discourse, and the giving of the sop to

Iudas was after supper, and the other three Evangelists agreeing that Christ instituted and distributed the Sacrament, as they did eate, before supper quite ended, it must follow that *Iudas* did receive the Sacrament.

Answ. 1. But how doth this hang together, first to argue that *Iudas* received the Sacrament, because Christs discourse concerning *Iudas*, and *Iudas* his question *Is it I?* were immediately before the institution of the Sacrament: and againe to prove that *Iudas* did receive the Sacrament, because Christs discourse about *Iudas* was after supper ended, and after the Sacrament which was instituted before supper ended? the one way of arguing destroyeth the other. 2. For that in *Matthew* and *Marke*, that Christ discoursed of the Traytor, and that *Iudas* said *Is it I?* before the institution of the Sacrament, I confesse; but that it was immediately before the institution of the Sacrament the Evangelists doe not say, neither doth he prove it. *Iudas* went out after that discourse and the sop, and how much of the consolatory and valedictory Sermon (which beginneth *Iohn* 13.31.) was spent before the distribution of the Sacrament, who is so wise as to know? 3. For that in *Luke*, I have proved that though he sets down the things, yet not in that order wherein they were done: which is also the opinion of *Grotius* upon that place. And for that *Iohn* 13.2. *Supper being ended*, I have answered before.

Shall we in the next place have a heape of humane testimonies concerning *Iudas* his receiving of the Sacrament? I see so much light from Scripture to the contrary, that I shall not be easily shaken with the authority of men: yet it shall not be amisse a little to trie whether it be altogether so as he would make us believe. He saith we goe *against all antiquity*, pag. 18. and against the most and best of Protestant writers, pag. 23. yea, that all ages have received it as an indubitable verity that *Iudas* received the Sacrament, pag. 19. No Sir, soft a little. The truth is the thing hath been very much controverted both among the Fathers, and among Papists, and among Protestant writers. I have found none so unanimous for *Iudas* his receiving of the Sacrament as the *Lutherans*, [i] endeavouring thereby to prove that the wicked hypocrites and unbe-

[i] *Gerhard. loc. com. tom. 5. pag. 186, 187. Petrus Hinckelmannus de Anabaptismo. disp. 5. cap. 2.*

unbelievers doe in the Sacrament eate the true body of Christ, and drinke his true blood, yet (as hot as they are upon it) they acknowledge it is no *indubitable verity*, they cite authorities against it as well as for it. See *Gerhard Harm. evang. cap. 171. Brochmand Tom. 3. pag. 2082.* Neither doe the Lutherans make any such use of *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament as Master *Prynne* doth: for they hold that not onely excommunicated persons, but scandalous and notorious sinners, not yet excommunicated, ought to be kept backe from the Lords Table: See *Gerhard loc. com. Tom. 5. 180, 181, 182.* where he proves distinctly that all these ought to be excluded from the Lords Supper. 1. Hereticks. 2. Notorious scandalous sinners. 3. Excommunicated persons. 4. Possessed persons, furious persons, and idiots. 5. Infamous persons, who use unlawfull arts, as Magitians, Negromancers, &c. and for the exclusion of scandalous sinners he citeth the Ecclesiasticall Electorall Constitutions. *L. Osiander Enchir. contra Anabap. cap. 6. quæst. 3.* tels us that the *Lutheran* Churches exclude all known scandalous persons from the Sacrament. But it is strangest to me that Mr *Prynne* will not give credit to some of the Testimonies cited by himselfe. *Theophylact. exar in Matth. 26.* saith *Quidam autem dicunt quod egresso Juda, tradidit Sacramentum aliis Discipulis, proinde & nos sic facere debemus, & malos à Sacramentis abarcere. Idem exar. in Marc. 14. Quidam dicunt* (but who they were appeares not saith Mr *Prynne*, in any extant worke of theirs) *Judam non fuisse participem Sacramentorum, sed egressum esse priusquam dominus Sacramenta traderet.* Shall we take this upon Mr *Prynnes* credit, that it doth not appeare in any extant worke of theirs? Nay, let him take better heed what he saith, and whereof he affirmeth. In the next page he himselfe excepteth one, which is *Hilary*; but except him onely, he saith that all the Ancients *unanimously accord herein, without one dissenting voyce.* But see now whether all is to be believed that Mr *Prynne* gives great words for. Tis well that he confesseth we have *Hilary* for us. First therfore let [b] the words of *Hilary* be observed. Next I will prove what he denieth, namely that others of the Ancients were of the same opinion.

Clemens lib. 5. constit. Apost. cap. 13. after mention of the Paschall

[b] *Hilarius Can. 30. in Matth.* Post quæ Judas proditor indicatur, sine quo pascha accepto calice & fracto pane confici-tur: dignus enim æternorum sacramentorum communione non fuerat &c. Neque sanè bibere cum eo poterat, qui non erat bibiturus in regno.

chall or typicall supper, addeth these words, as of the Apostles, παραδὺς δὲ ἡμῖν τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰούδα μὴ συμπαρόντος ἡμῖν. *But when he had delivered to us the antitype mysteries* (so called in reference to the Paschall supper) *of his precious body and blood, Judas not being present with us.* I doe not owne these eight bookes of the Apostolicall constitutions, as written by that *Clemens* who was *Pauls* fellow-labourer, *Phil.* 4. yet certainly they are ancient as is universally acknowledged. *Dionysius Areopagita* (or whosoever he was that anciently wrote under that name) *de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia cap. 3. part. 3. sect.* 1. speaking of the same bread, and the same cup, whereof all the communicants are partakers, he saith that this teacheth them a Divine conformity of manners, and withall cals to mind Christs supper in the night when he was betrayed Καθ' ὃ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεῖος συμβόλων δημιουργὸς, ἀπολήρους δικαίους τοὺς οὐχ ὁσίως αὐτῷ καὶ ὁμοδείπνους τὰ ἱερὰ συνδειπνήσαντας. *In qua cœna*: so *Ambrose* the Monke in his Latine translation, and *Judocus Clichtoveus* in his Commentary, In which supper (for καθ' ὃ relates to τὸ δεῖπνον the supper before mentioned, and signifieth the time of supper, or after supper was begun; so the Græcians use to say κατὰ τὸν νόσον to signifie *in the time of sickness*) *the authour himselfe of those Symbols doth most justly deprive or cast out him* (Judas) *who had not holily and with agreement of mind supped together with him, upon holy things.* By these holy things he understands (it should seem) the Typicall or Paschall supper, of which *Judas* had eaten before, and peradventure that night also, in the opinion of this Ancient. *Judocus Clichtoveus* in his Commentary saith onely, that *Judas* did that night eate together with Christ *cibum*, meate, he saith not *Sacramentum.* This ancient writer is also of opinion that Christ did excommunicate *Judas*, or as *Clichtoveus* expounds him, à *cæterorum discipulorum cœtu æquissime separavit, discrevit & dispescuit.* If you thinke not this cleare enough, heare the ancient Scholiast *Maximus* to whom the Centurists give the Testimony of a most learned and most holy man: He flourished in the seventh Century, under *Constans*, he was a chiefe opposer of the *Monothelites*, and afterwards a martyr. His *Scholia* upon that place of *Dionysius*, maketh this inference ὅτι μὴ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τὸν Ἰούδαν

ἐκ

ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, παρέδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὸ μυστήριον, *that after Iudas had gone forth from supper, Christ gave the mysiery to his Disciples.* Againe, Καὶ σημειώσαι, ὅτι καὶ αὐτῷ μετέδωκε τοῦ μυστικοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου. τὰ δὲ μυστήρια τοῖς μαθηταῖς μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τὸν δείπνου τὸν Ἰούδαν, ὡς ἀναξίου τότων ὄντος αὐτοῦ. *Where note, that to him also, (that is, to Iudas) he (Christ) gave of a mysticall bread (meaning the unleavened bread of the Passeover) and cup (meaning the cup drunke at the Paschall supper) but the mysteries (that is, the Eucharisticall bread and cup, commonly called the mysteries by ancient writers) he gave to his Disciples after Iudas went forth from supper, as it were because Iudas himselfe was unworthy of these mysteries.*

Adde hereunto the Testimony of *Georgius Pachymeres*, who lived in the thirteenth Century: in his Paraphrase upon that same place of *Dionysius*, he saith that Christ himselfe the author and institutor of this Sacrament, ἀποκλείει καὶ ἀποδιατέμνει δικαιότατα τὸν ἐκ δοίου συνδειπνήσαντα Ἰούδαν. καὶ αὐτῷ γὰρ τοῦ μυστικοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου μεταδοὺς, τὰ μυστήρια μόνοις τοῖς μαθηταῖς, μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἐκεῖνον ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, παρέδωκεν, ὡς ἀναξίου τότων ὄντος τοῦ Ἰούδα. *Christ doth cast out and separate or excommunicate most justly Judas, who had not holily supped together with him. For having given to him also of a mysticall bread and cup, he gave the mysteries to the Disciples alone, after he went forth from Supper, thereby as it were shewing that Iudas was unworthy of these mysteries.*

By the mysteries which *Maximus* and *Pachimeres* speake of, and which they say Christ gave to his Disciples, after *Judas* was gone forth, I can understand nothing, but the Eucharisticall supper, the Elements whereof are very frequently called *the mysteries* by the ancients, as hath been said. And if any man shall understand by these mysteries the inward graces or things signified in the Lords Supper, then what sence can there be in that which *Maximus* and *Pachimeres* say? for Christ could as easily keepe backe from *Iudas*, and give to his other Disciples, those graces and operations of his Spirit, when *Judas* was present among them, as when he was cast out. So that it could not be said that Christ did cast out *Judas* in order to the restraining from him, and giving to the other Disciples, the invisible inward grace signified in the Sacrament, as if the other Apostles had

had not received that grace at the receiving of the Sacrament, but that *Iudas* muſt firſt be caſt out, before they could receive it; or as if *Iudas* had received the inward grace, if he had not gone out from ſupper. The ſence muſt therefore be this, that *Iudas* as an unworthy perſon was caſt out by Chriſt, before he thought fit to give the Sacrament of his Supper unto his other Apoſtles.

Unto all theſe Teſtimonies adde *Ammonius Alexandrinus de quatuor Evangeliorum conſonantia, cap.* 155. where he hath the ſtory of *Iudas* his receiving of the ſop, and his going forth immediately after he had received it: thereafter *cap.* 156. he addeth the inſtitution and diſtribution of the Lords Supper, as being in order poſterior to *Iudas* his going forth. So likewiſe before him *Tacianus* doth make the Hiſtory of the inſtitution of the Sacrament to follow after the excluding of *Iudas* from the company of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: which neither of them had done, if they had not believed that *Iudas* was gone before the Sacrament. With all theſe agreeth [l] *Innocentius* the third, who holdeth expreſly that the Sacrament was not given till *Iudas* had gone forth: and that there is a recapitulation in the narration of *Luke*. Moreover as it is evident by the forementioned Teſtimonies of *Theophylact* that ſome of the Ancients did hold that Chriſt gave not the Sacrament to *Iudas*: ſo alſo the Teſtimony cited by Mr *Prynne* out of *Victor Antiochenus* beareth witneſſe to the ſame thing: *ſunt tamen qui Iudam ante porrectam Euchariſtiæ Sacamentum exiviſſe exiſtiment. But yet* (ſaith he) *there are who conceive that Iudas went forth before the Sacrament of the Euchariſt was given.* And with theſe words Mr *Prynne* cloſeth his citation out of *Victor Antiochenus*. But I will proceed where he left off. The very next words are theſe, *Sane Iohannes quiddam ejuſmodi ſubindicare videtur. Certainly Iohn ſeemeth to intimate ſome ſuch thing.* Which is more then halfe a conſenting with thoſe who thinke that *Iudas* went forth before the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. I ſhall end with two Teſtimonies of *Rupertus Tuitienſis*, [m] one upon the

[l] *Lib. 4. de myſter. Miſſæ cap. 13. Patet ergo quod Iudas prius exiit quàm Chriſtus traderet Euchariſtiam. Quod autem Lucas poſt calicem commemorat traditorem, per recapitulationem poteſt intelligi: Quia ſæpe fit in Scriptura ut quod prius factum fuerat poſterius enarretur.*

[m] That whole Chapter is ſpent in the debating of this queſtion. In *Joh. 6. de participatione autem corporis & ſanguinis ejus, poteſt aliquis opinari quod ille* (Judas) *interfuerit. Sed profecto diligentius Evangeliſtarum narratione, doctorumque conſiderata diverſitate, citius deprehendi, huic quoque Sacramento illum nequaquam interfuiſſe. Nam cum accepiſſet buccellam, qua traditor deſignatus eſt, exivit continuo.*

ſixth:

sixth: [n] another upon the thirteenth of *Iohn*. The latter of the two speaketh thus, being Englished. *But we must know, that, as it hath been also said before us, if Iudas after the sop did goe forth immediately, as a little after the Evangelist saith, without doubt, he was not present with the Disciples at that time when our Lord did distribute unto them the Sacrament of his owne body and blood.* And a little after, *Therefore by the Lords example the good ought indeed to tolerate the bad in the Church, untill by the fanne of judgement the graine be separated from the chaffe, or the tares from the wheate: but yet patience must not be so farre void of discerning, as that they should give the most sacred mysteries of Christ, to unworthy persons whom they know to be such.*

[n] *Idem in Jo.* 13. Sciendum verò est, quia, sicut & ante nos dictum est, si post bucellam continuo Judas exivit, sicut paulò post Evangelista dicit, proculdubio nequaquam Discipulis tunc interfuit, quando Dominus noster Sacramentum illis corporis & sanguinis sui distribuit. *Et paulo post.* Igitur exemplo Domini, tolerare quidem malos boni debent in Ecclesia, donec ventilabro Judicii granum à palea, vel à tritico separentur zizania: verumtamen non eo usque indiscreta debet esse patientia, ut indignis, quos noverunt, Sacrosancta Christi tradant mysteria.

As for moderne writers, this present question hath been debated by *Salmeron Tom.* 9. *Tract.* 11. and by Dr *Keller* in his *Tricœnium lib.* 2. *cap.* 14. both of them hold that *Iudas* did not receive the Lords Supper. *Mariana* on *Luke* 22.21. citeth authors for both opinions, and rejecteth neither. *Gerhard Harm. Evang. cap.* 171, citeth for the same opinion, that *Iudas* did not receive the Lords Supper, (beside *Salmeron*) *Turrianus* and *Barradius*: and of ours *Danæus*, *Musculus*, *Kleinwitzius*, *Piscator*, *& alii complures*, saith he, *and many others.*

[o] *Beza in Jo.* 13. 30. certa videtur esse eorum sententia qui existimant Judam institutioni sacræ cœnæ non interfuisse.

[p] *Tossanus in Joh.* 13. ita ut Judæ quidem laverit pedes Christus, sed postea egressus cœnæ Sacramentali non interfuerit, sicut eruditi multi ex hoc capite colligunt.

Adde also *Zanchius* upon the fourth Command. *Gomarus* (who professedly handleth this question upon *Iohn* 13.) [o] *Beza* puts it out of question, and [p] *Tossanns* tels us it is the judgement of many learned men, as well as his owne. [q] *Musculus* following *Rupertus*, concludeth that certainly *Iudas* was gone forth, before Christ gave the Sacrament to his Apostles. So likewise [r] *Diodati* and [s] *Grotius*.

[q] *Musculus in loc. com. de cœna Dom.* p. 352. Mihi sanè dubium non est, egressum ad perficiendum traditionis scelus fuisse Judam, priusquam Sacramentum hoc à Domino Discipulis traderetur. [r] *Diodati* upon *Iob* 13.30. *We may gather from hence that he* (Judas) *did not communicate of our Saviours Sacrament.* [s] *Grotius annot. in Mat.* 26.21, 26. *Luk.* 22.21. *Joh.* 13. holds that the Supper at which the sop was given to *Iudas*, and from which he went forth, was the common supper, and that it was before the Lords Supper, and that *Luke* doth not place Christs words concerning *Iudas* Luke 22.21. in the proper place.

By

By this time it appeareth that Mr *Prynne* hath no such consent of writers of his opinion, or against mine, as he pretendeth.

As for those Ancients cited by Mr *Prynne*, some of them (as *Origen* and *Cyrill*) did goe upon this great mistake that the sop which Christ gave to *Iudas*, was the Sacrament; which errour of theirs is observed by Interpreters upon the place. No marvell that they who thought so, were also of opinion that *Iudas* received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; for how could they choose to thinke otherwise, upon that supposition? But now the later Interpreters, yea Mr *Prynne* himselfe having taken away that which was the ground of their opinion, their Testimonies will weigh the lesse in this particular. *Chrysostome* thinks indeed that *Iudas* received the Sacrament, but he takes it to be no warrant at all for the admission of scandalous persons: for in one and the same Homily, *Hom.* 83 in *Matth* he both tels us of *Iudas* his receiving of the Sacrament, and discourseth at large against the admission of scandalous persons. As for *Bernard* Mr *Prynne* doth not cite his words nor quote the place. *Oecumenius* (in the passage cited by Mr *Prynne*) saith that the other Apostles and *Iudas* did eate together *communi mensa*, at a common Table; But he saith not *at the Sacrament of the Lords Supper*. That which *Oecumenius* in that place argueth against, is the contempt of the poore in the Church of *Corinth*, and the secluding of them from the love feasts of the richer sort. Now, saith he, if Christ himselfe admitted *Iudas* to eate at one and the same Table, with his other Disciples, ought not we much more admit the poore to eate at our Tables? Mr *Prynne* tels us also that *Nazianzen* in his *Christus patiens* agreeth that *Iudas* did receive the Lords Supper together with the other Apostles. I answer, first I finde no such thing in that place. Next, those verses so entituled, are thought to be done by some late author, and not by *Nazianzen*, as *Io. NeWenklaius* in his Censure upon them noteth, and giveth reason for it. *Cyprians* Sermon *de ablutione pedum*, as it is doubted of whether it be *Cyprians*, so the words cited by Mr *Prynne* doe not prove the point in controversie. The other Testimony cited out of *Cyprians* Sermon *de cœna Domini*, as it is not transcribed

scribed according to the originall, so if Mr *Prynne* had read all which *Cyprian* saith in that Sermon against unworthy receivers, peradventure he had not made use of that testimony. The words cited out of *Ambrose* doe not hold forth clearely *Judas* his receiving of the Eucharisticall Supper. The words cited out of *Augustine epist.* 162. *Judas accepit pretium nostrum*, are not there to be found, though there be something to that sence. It is no safe way of citations to change the words of Authors. This by the way. As for his other three citations out of *Augustine Tract.* 6. 26. & 62. in *Joh.* I can not passe them without two Animadversions. First, the greatest part of those words, which he citeth as *Augustines* words, and also as recited by *Beda* in his Commentary on 1 *Cor.* 11. is not to be found either in *Augustine* or *Beda* in the places by him cited; *viz.* these words: *Talis erat Judas, & tamen cum sanctis Discipulis undecim intrabat & exibat Ad ipsam cænam Dominicam pariter accessit, conversari cum iis potuit, eos inquinare non potuit: De uno pane & Petrus accipit & Iudas; & tamen quæ pars fideli & infideli? Petrus enim accepit ad vitam, manducat Judas ad mortem: Qui enim comederunt indigne judicium sibi manducat & bibit SIBI, NON TIBI, &c.* Of which last sentence if Mr *Prynne* can make good Latine, let him doe it, (for I can not) and when he hath done so, he may be pleased to looke over his Bookes better to seeke those words elsewhere, if he can finde them, for as yet he hath directed us to seeke them where they are not. My next Animadversion shall be this. The words of *Augustine*, which Mr *Prynne* alledgeth for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament, are these, *Tract.* 6. *in Joh. Num enim mala erat buccella quæ tradita est Judæ à Domino? Absit. Medicus non daret venenum: salutem medicus dedit, sed indigne accipiendo ad perniciem accepit, quia non placatus accepit.* Thus the originall, though not so recited by Mr *Prynne:* but that I passe, so long as he retaines the substance. Yet how will he conclude from these words that *Judas* received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, unlesse he make *Augustine* to contradict himselfe most grossely: for *Tract.* 62. *in Joh.* (another place whether Mr *Prynne* directeth us,) speaking of Christs giving of that *buccella* or sop to *Judas*, he saith,

Non autem ut putant quidam negligenter legentes, tunc Judas Christi corpus accepit: *but Judas did not at that time receive the body of Christ, as some negligently reading doe thinke.* Which words *Beda* also in his Comment on *Ioh.* 13. hath out of *Augustine.* It is *Augustines* opinion that the Sacrament was given before that time, at which *Iudas* was present. That which Mr *Prynne* citeth out of *Algerus* (a Monke, who in that same booke writeth expressly for Transubstantiation) maketh more against him then for him. For *Algerus* takes the reason of Christs giving the Sacrament to *Judas*, to be this, because his perverse conscience though knowne to Christ was not then made manifest, *Judas* not being accused and condemned: so that he was a secret, not a scandalous sinner. Thus farre we have a taste of Mr *Prynnes* citations of the Ancients. Peradventure it were not hard to finde as great flaws in some other of those citations. But it is not worth the while to stay so long upon it. Among the rest he citeth *Haymo* Bishop of *Halberstat* for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament. But he may also be pleased to take notice that *Haymo* would have no notorious scandalous sinner to receive the Sacrament, and holds that a man eats and drinks unworthily *qui gravioribus criminibus commaculatus præsumit illud (sacramentum) sumere*; that is, *who being defiled with haynous crimes presumeth to take the Sacrament*; but if he had thought it (as Master *Prynne* doth) the most effectuall ordinance, and readiest meanes to worke conversion and repentance, he could not have said so. That which Mr *Prynne* pag. 23. citeth out of the two confessions of *Bohemia* and *Belgia*, doth not assert that for which he citeth them. For neither of them saith that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. The *Belgik* confession saith an evill man may receive the Sacrament unto his own condemnation. *As for example, Judas and Simon Magus both of them did receive the Sacrament all signe.* I can subscribe to all this; for it is true in respect of the baptisme both of *Iudas* and *Simon Magus.* But I must here put Mr *Prynne* in minde, that the thing which he pleads for, is extreamly different from that which the *Belgick* Churches hold. For *Harmonia Synodorum Belgicarum cap.* 13. saith thus, *Nemo ad Cœnam dominicam admittatur, nisi qui fidei*

fidei Confessionem ante reddiderit, & Disciplinæ Ecclesiasticæ se subjecerit, & vitæ incu patæ testes fideles produxerit. Let no man be admitted to the Lords Supper, except he who hath first made a confession of his faith, and hath subjected himselfe to the Church Discipline, and hath proved himselfe by faithfull witnesses to be of an unblameable life. The other confession of *Bohemia* saith that *Iudas received the Sacrament of the Lord Christ himselfe, did also execute the function of a Preacher, and yet he ceased not to remaine a divell, an hypocrite, &c.* This needeth not be expounded of the Lords Supper (which if he had received, how did he still remaine an hypocrite? for that very night his wickednesse did breake forth and was put in execution) but of the Passeover received by *Iudas* once and againe, if not the third time. That Chapter is of Sacraments in generall, and that which is added, is concerning *Ananias* and his wife, their being baptised of the Apostles. However the very same Chapter saith that Ministers must throughly looke to it, and take diligent heed *lest they give holy things to dogs, or cast Pearles before swine.* Which is there applied to the Sacraments, and is not understood of preaching and admonishing onely as Mr *Prynne* understands it. Also the Booke entituled *Ratio Disciplinæ ordinisque Ecclesiastici in unitate fratrum Bohemorum cap.* 7. appointeth not onely Church-discipline in generall, but particularly suspension from the Lords Table of obstinate offenders. Finally, whereas M. *Prynne* citeth a passage of the antiquated Common prayer Booke, as it hath lost the authority which once it had, so that passage doth not by any necessary inference hold forth that *Iudas* received the Sacrament, as D. *Kellet* sheweth at some length in his *Tricænium.*

The citation in which M. *Prynne* is most large, is that of *Alexander Alensis part.*4. *Quæst.*11. *membr.* 2. *art.*1. *sect.* 4. (though not so quoted by him) But for a retribution, I shall tell him three great points, in which *Alexander Alensis* in that very dispute of the receiving of the Eucharist, is utterly against his principles. First, *Alexander Alensis* is of opinion that the precept *Matth.*7.6. *Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye Pearles before swine,* doth extend to the denying the Sacra-

ment to known prophane Christians; for both in that Section which hath been cited, and *art.3. sect.1.* answering objections from that Text, he doth not say, that it is meant of the word, not of the Sacrament, and of Infidels, Hereticks, Persecutors, not of prophane ones: but he ever supposeth, that the Ministers are forbidden by that Text, to consent to give the Sacrament to prophane scandalous sinners. Secondly, *Alexander Alensis* holds, that Christs giving of the Sacrament to *Iudas*, is no warrant to Ministers to give the Sacrament to publique notorious scandalous sinners, though they doe desire it. And thus he resolveth *Ib. art.3. sect.1. If the Priest know any man by confession to be in a mortall sinne; he ought to admonish him in secret, that he approach not to the Table of the Lord: and he ought to deny unto such a one the body of Christ, if he desire it in secret. But if he desire it in publique, then either his sinne is publique or secret.* If publique, he ought to deny it unto him; *neither so doth he reveale sinne because it is publique: If private, he must give it, lest a worse thing fall out.* Thirdly, *Alexander Alensis* holds the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, not to be a converting, but a confirming and conserving Ordinance *Ibid. art.2. sect.2.* His words I shall cite in the debating of that controversie.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Whether Judas *received the Sacrament of the Passeover that night in which our Lord was betrayed.*

Mr *Prynne* (distrusting peradventure the strength of his proofes for *Judas* his receiving of the Lords Supper) betakes himselfe to an additionall argument pag. 24. *All our Antagonists*, saith he, *and the Evangelists clearely agree that Judas did eate the Passeover with Christ himselfe, as well as the other Apostles: now the Paßeover was a type of the Lords Supper, &c.* It seems he had not the notes of my Sermon truly (though he endeavour to confute it) for I did then, and I doe still make a very great question of it, whether *Judas* did so much as eate the Passeover at that time with Christ and the other Apostles: and I thinke I have very considerable reasons which make it probable that *Judas* did not eate the Passeover that night with Christ and the Apostles. The resolution of this question depends upon another, whether Christ and his Apostles did eate the Passeover before that supper at which he did wash his Disciples feet, and gave the sop to *Judas* (after the receiving whereof *Judas* immediately went out) or whether that supper was before the eating of the Passeover. I finde[t] some others as well as my selfe have been of opinion, that it was before, not after the Passeover; (yea that the Jewish custome was to eate their common Supper before the Passeover. See M. *Weemse* his *Christian Synagogue* pag 120.) I finde also *Ammonius Alexandrinus de quatuor Evangeliorum consonantia cap.* 154. placeth that supper mentioned *John* 13. 2, 4, 12, 18. at which Jesus did wash his Disciples feet, and when he had done sate down againe, and told them that he who was eating bread with him should betray him. Then *cap.* 155. he proceedeth to the story of the Paschall supper, in which he conceiveth the sop was given to *Judas*; but in this particular he did much mistake; for the sop was given at the same supper.

[t] *Gerhard. Harm. Evang. cap.* 170. Quidam statuunt pedum lotionem ipsi etiam legali cœnæ sive agni paschalis esui præmittendam esse.

supper mentioned *Iohn* 13. 2,4,12,18. and not at the Paschall Supper (as M *Prynne* also acknowledgeth,) This is cleare, that *Ammonius* placeth the common supper at which Christ did wash his Disciples feet, and told them of the Traitor, to have been before the Paschall supper. I will first tell the reasons that incline me this way, and then answer the objections which may seem to be against it. The reasons are these:

1. The orientall custome was to wash before meal, not after they had begun to eate.

2. This Supper (in which the sop was given to *Iudas*, whereupon he went away) was *before the Feast of the Passeover*, *Ioh.* 13. 1. πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, meaning immediately before the feast of the Passeover, it being reckoned from the time of eating the Paschall Lambe, and so *before the Feast of the Passeover*, hath the same sence as *Luke* 11. 38. πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου, the Pharisee wondred that Christ had not washed *before dinner*, that is immediately before dinner. So here I undestand *before the Feast of the Passeover*, that is immediately before the time of eating the Paschall Lambe, which was the beginning of the Feast of the Passeover. You will say perhaps that Christ did not eate the Passeover upon the same day that the Jewes did, and so those words *before the Feast of Passeover*, may be understood before the Passeover of the Jewes, not before the Passeover of Christ. I answer, whether Christ and the Jewes kept the Passeover at one time, is much debated among Interpreters. *Baronius*, *Toletus*, and divers others hold that Christ did eate the Paschall Lambe upon the same day with the Jewes. *Scaliger*, *Causabon*, and others hold the contrary. The question hath been peculiarly debated between *Joh. Cloppenburgius*, and *Ludovicus Capellus*, yet so that *Capellus* (who followes *Scaliger* and *Casaubon*) acknowledgeth that both opinions have considerable reasons, and both are straitned with some inconveniencies. ΕΠΙΚΡΙΣΙΣ *de ultimo Christi pascha* pag. 6. & 22. For my part, I shall not contend: but admit the distinction of Christs Passeover and the Jewes Passeover; yet saith *Maldonat* upon *Joh.* 13.1. I doubt not but *John* understands Christs Passe-over; for all the Evangelists in the story of the last Supper when they speake

speake of the Passeover, they mean Christs Passeover, and it was the true Passeover according to the Law.

3. That which makes many to thinke that Christ did eate the Passeover before that other Supper in which he gave the sop to *Judas*, is a mistake of the Jewish custome, which as they conceive was to eate other meat after, but none before the Paschall Lambe. Now to me the contrary appeareth, namely, that whatsoever the Jewes did eate before the Paschall Supper, in the night of the Passeover, was eaten before the Paschall Supper, and it was among them forbidden to eate any thing after the Paschall Supper. Which may be proved not onely by that Talmudicall Canon (cited by *D. Buxtorf in hist. instit. cœnæ Dom.*) which saith, *The Passeover is not eaten except after meal:* but also more plainly by [w] *Liber rituum paschalium* lately translated and published by *Rittangelius:* and by another Canon cited by [x] *Martinius.*

[w] Non dimittunt (cætum comedentium) post esum (agni) paschalis cum bellariis (Hoc est non sinunt cætum comedentium post esum agni paschalis comedere secundarum mensarum delitias) *Ibid. versus finem.* Comedentium cætus sic dimittitur, ut nihil amplius cibi aut bellariorum aut similes secundarum mensarum delitias, quæ ad commessationes pertinent, illis comedere aut quicquam bibere permissum sit: non enim in more habent post sacram hanc cænam indulgere commessationibus & potationibus, imo ne minimum quidem gustant. [x] *Matth. Martinius lexic. philol. pag. 2529. Nam jam Canon paschalis diserte interdicebat, post poculum laudationis, aliquid cibi aut potus sumere.* Interdicitur comedere aliquid post poculum hymni. *Hic fuit verus ritus celebrationis paschæ temporibus Messiæ, &c.*

But there are two arguments which may be brought to prove that *Judas* did eate the Passeover with Christ and the Apostles. 1. Because that Supper at which *Judas* got the sop, was after the Paschall supper, for it is said *John* 13.2. *Supper being ended.* Which must be meant of the Paschall supper. I answer these words may very well be understood not of the Paschall supper, but of that other supper at which the sop was given to *Judas.* And as for δείπνου γενομένου: some Greeke copies have γινομένου and *Nonnus* γινομένοιο: so the sence were as *Augustine* expounds, Supper being prepared and ready and set on Table. But be it γινομένου or γενομένου, the matter is not great; for there is no necessity of expounding δείπνου γενομένου, thus, when Supper was done

done or ended. It may suffer other two sences. One is, that of *Augustine*, when it was Supper time, or when Supper was set on Table. And this sence is followed by *Albinus Flaccus Alcuinus lib. de divinis Officiis, Artic. de Cœna Domini. Circa vesperam vero cœnâ factâ, id est paratâ, & ad convivantium mensam usque perductâ, non transactâ neque finitâ, surgit Jesus à cœnâ & ponit vestimenta, &c.* So likewise *Mariana* upon *Joh.* 13.2. tels us that *cœnâ factâ*, may well be expounded, *cœ â paratâ*, or *ante cœnam*, or *cum cœnæ tempus adesset*, which he cleareth by the like formes of speech in other Scriptures.

Secondly, δείπνου γενομένου may very well be translated, *when supper was begun*, or *when they were at Supper*, as I have before shewed by like instances in the New Testament, *Matth.* 26. 6. 20. Things permanent as a house, or the like are said to be *factæ*, when they are ended and compleate. But things which are successive are said to be *factæ*, when they are begun, as *dies factus*, not when the day is ended, but when it is begun. So here, there can be no more proved from the words, but that supper was begun, or they were at supper. This sence is given by *Osiander*, *Erasmus*, *Tossanus harm. evang. part* 3. *cap.* 1. beside the Centurists, *Salmeron*, and *Lud. de Dieu* before cited.

The other argument may be this. *Matthew*, *Marke* and *Luke*, after they have told of the making ready of the Passeover, adde that Christ *sate downe with the Twelve.*

Ans. 1. It cannot be proved, that this is meant of sitting down to eate the Passeover; nay, it rather appeareth from the Text, that it was to eate that other supper, at which the sop was given to *Judas*; The same discourse and questioning concerning the Traytor, which *John* sets down before *Judas* his getting of the sop and going out; is recorded by *Matthew* and *Marke*, to have been in that first supper, unto which Christ sate down with the twelve when even was come. Therefore Christs sitting down with the twelve *Matth.* 26.20,21. *Mark* 14.17, 18. being spoken of that supper at which Christ told his Disciples that one of them should betray him, and every one asked *Is it I?* (which by Mr *Prynnes* confession was not the Paschall

Paschall, but the ordinary supper.) It followeth that the sitting down with the twelve is not meant of the Passeover, but of an ordinary supper before the Passeover.

2. The same words of Christs sitting down with the twelve are expounded (though upon other considerations) as spoken in reference not to the Paschall, but the ordinary or common supper, by *Lorinus in Psal.* 101. 6. following *Maldonat*, and by *Gerhard. Harm. Evang. cap.* 170. p. 403. Their reason is, because according to the Law, the Passeover was to be eaten standing, not sitting: but that is more then can be proved from the Law which doth not so much as speake of standing at the first Passeover. It is no necessary consequence: they had their staves in their hands, *ergo* they were standing. This by the way.

3. Granting that Christs sitting downe with the twelve were spoken of the Paschall supper, yet the paschall supper being after the other supper, at which *Judas* got the sop and went away (which I now suppose for the reasons before-mentioned till I see better reasons to the contrary.) It might be said, after *Judas* was gone, that Christ sate down with the twelve, as well as 1 *Cor.* 15. 5. it is said of Christ risen from the dead, *he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve*, though he was seen onely of the eleven, and *Judas* was gone to his place. Which answers all that can be said from *Luke* 22. 14, 15.

If I have not said so much, as to put it out of all question that *Judas* did not eate of the Passeover with Christ and his Apostles, yet I am sure I have cleared so much as this, that Master *Prynne* will not be able to prove convincingly that *Judas* did eate of the Passeover that night with Christ.

I will conclude with the pious observation of Mr *Cartwright:* that it was not a vaine or idle question, which the Disciples propounded, (being commanded to prepare the Passeover) they aske, *where wilt thou that we prepare? Luke* 22. 8, 9. for Christ having commanded them, that into whatsoever City they entered, they should enquire who were godly therein, and turne in to such, to lodge and to eate there; They did thereby easily

underſtand, that if in common and ordinary eating together, then much more in this ſacred feaſt, they muſt turne in to the families of the godly, and avoyd the prophane; eſpecially conſidering that they who were of that houſhold were to eate the Paſſeover with Chriſt and his Diſciples, according to the Law From this very example of the Paſſeover he drawes an argument for keeping off all ungodly and prophane perſons from the Sacrament, ſo farre as is poſſible. Thus *Cartwright Harm. Evang. lib.* 3. *pag.* 162. The like obſervation *Chryſoſtome* hath upon *Matth.* 26. 18. *I will keepe the Paſſeover at thy houſe with my Diſciples.* He bids us marke thoſe words *with my Diſciples:* not with prophane or ſcandalous ones, but *with my Diſciples.* To the like purpoſe *Ititus Boſtrorum Epiſcopus in Luke* 22. hath this obſervation. *Non manducat autem hoc paſcha cum Judæis, ſed tantum cum Diſcipulis ſuis: Siquidem Judæi, propter obſtinatam incredulitatem, hoc paſchate indigni erant. Yet he eateth not this Paſſeover with the Jewes, but onely with his own Diſciples: for as much as the Jews, becauſe of their obſtinate incredulity, were unworthy of this Paſſeover.*

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

That if it could be proved that Judas *receeived the Lords Supper, it maketh nothing againſt the Suſpenſion of known wicked perſons from the Sacrament.*

I Have now done with the firſt part of this Controverſie concerning *Iudas*, and have diſproved that which Mr *Prynne* hath ſaid either for *Iudas* his receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, or for his eating of the Paſſeover. In which particulars, though learned and godly Divines who are againſt the admiſſion of ſcandalous ſinners to the Sacrament, are not all of one opinion, yet all looke upon it as a matter of debate, and I know none that ever cried downe with ſcorne and contempt the opinion of *Judas* his not receiving of the Sacrament, except Mr *Prynne* whoſe grounds are oftimes weakeſt where his aſſertions are ſtrongeſt.

I proceed to the ſecond anſwer. Granting that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament, that can make nothing for the admiſſion of ſcandalous ſinners whoſe prophanneſſe and ungodly converſation is knowne, and maketh their name to ſtinke in the Church. For *Judas* his wickedneſſe was not publique nor knowne before he had got the ſop and gone out, and left the company of Chriſt and the Apoſtles. And moreover he who argueth from Chriſts receiving of *Judas* to the Sacrament, when though his ſinne was yet ſecret, yet Chriſt knew him to be a divell; to prove that the Elderſhip may and ought to admit one to the Sacrament, whom they know to be a *Judas*, a Divell: may as well argue from Chriſts chooſing of *Judas* to be an Apoſtle when he knew him to be a Divell, to prove the lawfulneſſe of the Elderſhips chooſing of a Miniſter whom they know to be a divell. But now for that point of the ſcandall or ſecreſie of *Judas* his ſinne, let us heare Mr *Prynnes* reply, pag. 26, 27. He gives it foure feet to runne upon. But the truth

is, it hath but two (the same things being twice told) and those how foundered you shall see by and by.

First he saith, that at the time when Christ instituted the Sacrament he foretold the Disciples that *Iudas* should betray him *John* 13.18. to 28. *Matth.*26.20. to 26. *Marke* 14.18. to 22. *Luke* 22.21,22,23. More plainly pag.27. he saith, Christ did admit *Judas, to eate the Passover and Sacrament with his other Disciples, and they made not any scruple of conscience to communicate with him in both, no not after Christ had particularly informed them, and Judas himselfe, that he should betray him, Matth.* 26.21. to 36.

Answ. 1. It was but just now that Mr *Prynne* told us, (to manifest that *Judas* was at the Sacrament) that *Luke* placeth Christs words concerning *Judas*, after the Sacrament, not before it. And more expressely he told us out of *John* that Christs discourse about *Judas*, and his informing of the Disciples that one of them should betray him, and his giving the sop to *Iudas*, was after the Sacrament, because it was after supper ended, the Sacrament being instituted and distributed before supper ended *Vindic.* pag.18,19. & 25. The same thing which before he made to be after the Sacrament, to prove that *Iudas* did receive the Sacrament, the very same he now makes to be before the Sacrament, that he may prove *Iudas* a scandalous sinner and a known Traitor, even before his receiving of the Sacrament. And shall he thus abuse not onely his Reader, but the Word of God it selfe with palpable and grosse contradictions? I shall beseech him in the feare of God to looke to it, and never more to take this liberty to put contrary sences upon the holy Scripture, so as may seeme to serve most for his present advantage. Surely such lucubrations are not onely *subitane* but *sinfull.*

2. His answer which now he gives us doth clearely yeeld these two things: 1. That the Discourse about the Traytor, and the giving of the sop, *John* 13.8. to vers.28. was before the Sacrament; Now *Iudas* having gone out immediately after the sop, hereby Master *Prynne* strengthneth my argument which I brought to prove that *Iudas* did not receive the Sacrament; which

which argument in this very particular he formerly opposed. 2. He hath here also yeelded that these words *Luke* 22. 21, 22, 23. *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table, &c.* though mentioned after the Sacrament (which is the most colourable argument for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament) yet were spoken before the Sacrament, and that the order of time is not to be gathered from *Luke* but from *Matthew* and *Marke* who record that discourse about *Judas* before the Sacrament. And in yeelding this, he takes off his own strongest argument, and confirmes what I have before taken pains to prove.

3. Those Divines that hold *Judas* did receive the Sacrament, doe conceive that those words, *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me, &c.* were indeed spoken after the Sacrament, and that *Luke* placeth them in their proper place. And so holding that the discourse about the Traytor was after the Sacrament, they doe thereby intimate that *Judas* was not knowne to be the Traytor, till after the Sacrament. Wherefore either a man must quit the most considerable argument for *Judas* his receiving of the Sacrament, or else acknowledge that *Judas* was not knowne by the Disciples to be the Traytor till after the Sacrament.

4. When after the giving of the sop Christ said to *Judas*, That thou dost, doe quickly, *No man at the Table knew for what intent he spake this unto him, Iohn* 13. 28. But if Christ had particularly informed them that *Judas* was the Traytor, how is it that they could have been so altogether ignorant of Christs intent, as to thinke that he was still trusting *Judas* with the buying of what they had need of against the Feast, or with giving to the poore? Hence *Lud. Capellus Spicileg. in Ioh.* 13. collecteth that when *Iohn* asked of Christ, who it was, and when Christ said, *He it is unto whom I shall give the sop*, this was but a secret conference, and the rest of the Disciples did not heare it: else they could not have been so ignorant of it.

5. The places cited by Mr *Prynne* doe not prove that Christ did particularly tell and informe his Disciples that *Judas* (but that one of them) should betray him. Christ made it known to

to *Iohn* alone by the signe of giving the sop, *Ioh.* 13.26. Yea *Theophylact.* upon *Ioh.* 13. thinkes, that as the other Apostles heard not what Christ said to *Iohn* concerning the Traytor, so *Iohn* himselfe even at that instant could hardly imagine that *Judas* would commit so great wickednesse. *Nullus ergo cognovit*, saith he, *no man did know it*, which he gathers from the words of *Iohn* himselfe, vers. 28,29. *Bucerus* in *Matth.* 26.23. holdeth the same. I know some thinke it was made knowne to all the Disciples by that *Matth.* 26.25. *Then Iudas which betrayed him answered and said, Master Is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.* But others answer that it is not certaine that Christ said this to *Judas* in the hearing of all the Disciples: also that these words *Thou hast said*, are not a cleare affirmation of the thing. *Lud. Capellus Spicileg. in Matth.* 26. admitteth these words *Thou hast said*, to be affirmative of that which had been said. But he moves this doubt: when *Judas* had said *Is it I?* he did not affirme the thing, but doubted of it. How then did Christ returne such an answer as agreeth to that which *Judas* had said, as if it had been a positive truth. He gives this solution, that Christ as searcher of the heart did speake it to *Judas*, who was in his conscience convinced that he was the man, and so assenteth to the truth of that testimony of his Conscience. Now this could not be certainly known to the other Apostles. For my part I shall not need to contend much about that: for granting it to be a cleare information to all the Disciples that *Iudas* was the Traytor, yet (by their principles who hold *Iudas* did receive the Sacrament) this was after, not before the Sacrament, for they make the anticipation to be in *Matthew* and *Marke*, and the true order to be in *Luke*.

6. Beside that of the French Catechisme, which saith the impiety of *Iudas* was concealed, and not broken forth into the light and knowledge of men when the Sacrament was given: take these other Testimonies, *Martyr. in* 1 *Cor.* 5. *Et quod attinet ad Judam, peccatum ejus non erat cognitum atque perspectum, nec ullo judicio convictum. Gerhard. Harm. Evang. cap.* 171. *pag.* 453, *Judæ scelus nondum erat in lucem productum, sed animo suo illud adhuc clausum tenebat.* The same he hath in his common places

places *Tom.* 5. *pag.* 181. where he sheweth that *Iudas* receiving of the Sacrament maketh nothing for the admission of scandalous persons, because although *Iudas* had gone to the chiefe Priests and agreed with them, this was knowne to none of the Disciples, at that time, but to Christ himselfe onely. Nay the Testimony cited by Mr *Prynne* himselfe out of *Algerus de Sacram.* maketh strongly against him in this particular: *Quia enim* (saith *Algerus*) *Iudas accusatus & damnatus non fuerat, ideo Christus conscientiam ejus perversam, quamvis sibi notam damnare noluit. For because Iudas was not accused & condemned, therefore Christ would not condemne* (openly) *his perverse conscience, though known to himselfe. Innocentius* 3 in the place above cited *De myst. Missæ lib.* 4. *cap.* 13. after he hath asserted that *Iudas* did not receive the Lords Supper, he addeth, that if it should be granted that *Iudas* did receive it, this onely will follow at most, that Ministers are to admit to the Sacrament such as are not known to the Church, to be impious or wicked, as *Iudas* his wickednesse was not at that time knowne to the Disciples. Likewise both *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact* upon *John* 13. are cleare in this, that *Iudas* hypocrisie was not detected to the Apostles till Christ did separate him, and he went forth. Moreover I shall minde Mr *Prynne* how he himselfe doth apply this example of *Iudas* in his *Independency examined*, pag. 8, 9. he argueth thus: *Whether Independents refusall to admit such Christians who are not notoriously scandalous in their lives, nor grossly ignorant in the principles of Religion, to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, &c. onely upon this suspition or apprehension, that they are but carnall men, not truly regenerated or sanctified by Gods Spirit (though they can not certainly judge of their present spirituall conditions infallibly known to God alone) be not a very uncharitable arrogant, yea unchristian practice, contrary to our Saviours owne immediate example, who at the first institution of this Sacrament admitted Iudas* to his last Supper, as well as his *Disciples, though he certainly knew him to be both a Traytor and a Divell.* In which argumentation he himself supposeth that *Iudas* was not notoriously scandalous, nor knowne to the Disciples, (but to God and Christ alone) to be a Traytor and Divell. For otherwise he could

could not in any reason argue thus against the Independents: because if this supposition be not laid downe that *Judas* was an unregenerate yet not a scandalous person: then the Independents had this obvious answer, that if his Argument prove any thing, it doth conclude the admission not onely of unregenerat d and unsanctified, but of scandalous persons, to the Sacrament; whereas he brings it to prove against them, that persons not scandalous, though unregenerate, ought not to be refused the Sacrament. And now he brings the same thing against us to prove that scandalous persons ought to be admitted, if not excommunicated, and desirous to receive the Sacrament. He tels us by the way of *Judas his theevish, covetous, as well as traiterous disposition Iohn* 12.6. *both which did make him scandalous.* But he might have observed, that the holy Ghost sheweth plainly that in that act *Judas* was not a scandalous sinner in the esteeme of the other Disciples: for his theevish covetous dispositon was not known to the Disciples; yea the pretext of his care for the poore was so plausible to them (though abominable to Christ who knew his heart) that it is said, not onely of *Judas*, but of the Disciples (by his instigation) *they had indignation* at the wasting of that which might have been sold for much and given to the poore, *Matth.*26 8.

Let us now heare Mr *Prynnes* other answer *Vindic.* pag 26,27. he tels us that though perchance the other Disciples did not know that *Judas* was a Traytor and a Divell, yet Christ himselfe did infallibly know all this of *Judas*, and did notwithstanding admit him to the Sacrament. Whereupon he beseecheth all Ministers not to make themselves wiser, holier, rigider in this point then Christ himselfe.

Answ. 1. If Ministers did take upon them to suspend men from the Sacrament upon their owne private knowledge of some secret sinnes whereof those men are guilty: his argument might say somewhat. But the question being of suspension by the Eldership upon the notoreity or proofe of the offence, and consistoriall formall conviction of the offender, he saith here nothing to that point.

2. What

2. What a Minister should do when he certainly knows one of the Congregation (not convict nor notoriously scandalous) to be a *Judas*, a Traytor, a Divell, I will not now dispute. But surely Mr *Prynnes* reason why the minister ought to admit such a one, is not rightly applied, * for Christ did then know *Judas* to be a Traytor and a Divel, but how? not as man, by sight, information, or the like, but as God and as omniscient, that is, he knew *Judas* by that same knowledge whereby he knows close hypocrites in whom no eye of man hath seen any thing scandalous, but rather good and promising signes; some of this kind no doubt are admitted to the Sacrament both among Presbyterians and Independents, whom Christ knowes to be *Judasses*, because he knows what is in man. But now for a Minister to know (not the heart and the reines as Christ doth, but) τὰ πράγματα or τὰ ῥήματα some foule act which a man hath done, and some wicked profession which a man hath made, though in private, and not yet known to the world; this is a very different case from the other, and if Christ had admitted *Judas* to the Sacrament, knowing him by his divine knowledge to be a Traytor, this could not prove, that a Minister ought to admit a Traytor, whom by his humane knowledge he knows to be such.

* *Durantus de ritibus lib. 2. cap. 38. num. 16.* Ipsi tamen (Judæ) corpus & sanguinem suum dedit, ne occultum peccatorem sine accusatore & evidenti probatione, ab aliorum communione separaret. *Et infra num. 17. Nam* etsi Christo nota erat Judæ iniquitas, sicut Deo: non tamen ei cognita erat eo modo, quo hominibus innotescit.

3. And if that which Christ did in this particular ought to be a president to Ministers what to doe in like cases: Then as Christ had a most sad and moving discourse about the Traytor, till *Judas* himselfe was made to understand, that Christ knew his traiterous purpose, and then he said to him, *That thou dost doe quickly*, which [x] diverse doe rightly conceive to be

[x] *Gerhard. Har. Evang cap. 171.* Christus his verbis Judam quasi excommunicat, & ex Apostolorum collegio discedere jubet, cum se totum Diabolo tradidisset. *Quod facis fac citius*, id est, cum alii Magistro te addixeris, & me audire pertinaciter renuas, abi ex meo & apostolorum meorum conspectu, &c. *Ambros. lib. 2. de Cain & Abel cap. 4. Quod facis fac celerius*, quid illud? ut quia introierat in illum Satanas, ipse abiret à Christo. Ejicitur itaque & excluditur, eo quod jam cum Domino Jesu esse non posset, qui cæperat esse cum diabolo. *Estius in lib. 4. Sent. dist. 19. sect. 9.* Quia & ipse Christus hanc potestatem qua traduntur homines Sathanæ, exercuisse videtur, quando *Judam* à suo consortio removit, atque abire jussit dicendo, *Quod facis, fac citius. Chrysostome Hom. 71. in Joh.* (according to the Greek *Hom. 72.*) making a Transition unto that Text, *That thou dost, doe quickly*, he useth these words, to expresse what Christ was at that instant doing to *Iudas* καὶ ἀφώρισεν and againe, καὶ ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν, Christ did separate him from the rest of the Apostles, and cast him out. *Theophylact.* upon the same place: *illum divisit Dominus & separavit ab aliis discipulis.*

as much, as if Christ had said to him, Get you gone, I have no more to doe with you: He spake it, *ut a consortio suo recederet*, that he might be gone out of his company, as *Ambrose* takes it: and thus did by the Sword of his mouth chase away and as it were excommunicate *Judas* before the Sacrament. So should a Minister (if he see one in the Congregation whom he certainly knows to be a *Judas*, and to be living in some abominable wickednesse, even whiles he comes with a professed desire to receive the Sacrament) tell the Congregation, that he knows and sees one amongst them whom he certainly knows to be guilty of such a particular secret horrible sinne, and (if it be possible) make the sinner himselfe to know by such or such a signe, that he is the man whom he speakes of, and not to leave off powerfull checks, sharpe rebukes, terrible comminations, till by the blessing of God and the power of the word, he get such a one terrified and chased away.

4. It shall not be in vaine to observe here that *Gamachæus in tertiam partem Thomæ Quæst. 64. c. 4.* though he hold that Christ gave the Sacrament to *Judas* (whence he argueth that the Sacraments doe infallibly worke *ex opere operato*, where no barre is put, though there be no faith nor devotion exercised in the receiver) yet he doth immediately move this objection, It is unlawfull to give the Sacraments to the unworthy, and to such as live in mortall sinne. Whereunto y he answereth, that it is indeed unlawfull to Ministers to give the Sacrament to the unworthy, when they can refuse them without scandall (a restriction which I suppose Mr *Prynne* dare not owne; for if the lawfulnesse or unlawfulnesse of the thing must be determined by the scandall, they goe upon a very slippery ground.) He addeth that it is unlawfull to us to follow Gods example in giving holy things to the unworthy, as it is unlawfull to follow his example in the permitting of sinne when we can hinder it. The like I finde in *Alexander Alensis, Summa Theol. part. 4.*

y Respondemus id nobis revera esse illicitum, & peccare Ministros qui dant Sacramenta indignis, quando sine scandalo denegare possunt, attamen Deum his legibus non teneri, cum sit

supremus Dominus, qui suis donis utitur, prout voluerit, quemadmodum etiam Deus non peccat permittendo hominum peccata, imò & ad peccati substantiam concurrendo; nobis verò, nec concurrere licet nec permittere aliquod peccatum, quando sufficienter & moraliter id impedire possumus.

Quæst.

Quæst. 11. *membr.* 2. *art.* 1. *sect.* 4. where he moves this objection in the question, whether Christ gave the Sacrament to *Judas*. Christ himselfe hath commanded, *Give not that which is holy to dogs, &c.* and it seems he would not doe the contrary of that which himselfe commandeth. Unto this objection his answer is, that this prohibition lieth indeed upon the Ministers, Dispencers of the Sacraments, but bindeth not Christ himselfe the Law-maker. As long therefore as we are able to prove from Scripture, that scandalous persons ought to be keep back from the Sacrament, and that it is unlawfull for Church-officers to admit such; the Erastians doe but weakly helpe themselves by arguing from Christs giving the Sacrament to *Judas*. Which I have said by way of concession: for my opinion is, that Christ did upon the matter excommunicate *Judas*, and that his practice in this very particular is a patterne to us, which I hope I have made evident.

Finally, it is observed by *Jo. Baptista de Rubeis* in his *Novum rationale divinorum officiorum lib.* 1. *cap.* 24. that this cause of *Judas* doth not concerne publique and known scandalous persons, but secret and lurking wicked persons, when they publikely desire to receive the Sacrament; who yet (saith he) ought to be admonished and dehorted by the Minister, that they come not to the Sacrament: and if such a one make his desire to receive the Sacrament secretly known to the Minister, the Minister ought to refuse him, though his sinne be yet secret, and not publiquely known. * *But if the sinne be open or manifest, then whether the sinner do secretly or openly desire to receive the Sacrament, the Minister ought to refuse him.*

* Si verò peccatum est manifestum, tunc verò sive in occulto sive in manifesto petit, debet ei denegare.

Chap. XI.

Whether it be a full discharge of duty to admonish a scandalous person of the danger of unworthy communicating? And whether a Minister in giving him the Sacrament after such admonition, be no way guilty?

Mr. *Prynne* pag. 28. stateth the seventh point in difference thus, *Whether the Minister hath not fully discharged his duty and conscience if he give warning to unworthy communicants of the danger they incurre by their unworthy approaches to the Lords Table, and seriously dehort them from comming to it, unlesse they repent, reforme, and come preparedly?* But here he much mistakes his marke, or hitteth it not, as may appeare thus. First, what if we should affirme it, as he doth? What hath he gained thereby? That the Minister hath not the power of keeping backe scandalous persons: which cannot adde one dram weight to his cause. The power is seated in the Eldership, of which the Minister is a principall member: even as *Aristotle polit. lib. 3. cap. 11.* tels us that ὁ βουλευτὴς is not the ἄρχων but ἡ βουλὴ. It is not the *Senator* but the *Senat* that doth rule. But if Mr *Prynne* meant to conclude against the suspension of scandalous persons not excommunicated (the thing which all along he opposeth,) he ought to have stated the point thus; *Whether the Eldership hath not fully discharged their duty, &c.* For every branch of this controversie concerning Suspension (which is an act of jurisdiction and censure) must be fixed upon the Eldership, not upon the Minister. There is a huge difference between the Ministers personall duty, and the censure of suspension: in so much that if the affirmative of this present question (as he stateth it) were yeelded to him; it derogateth nothing from the power of the Eldership to suspend from the Sacrament a person not excommunicate. Secondly, in the debating of this point he sometimes argueth against the refusing or withholding of the Sacrament.

crament *by any Minister or Presbytery* as pag. 29,30,31. sometimes he argueth that *no Ministers private judgement or conscience ought to be the rule of his admitting any to, or suspending them from the Sacrament*, as pag. 32. Which is a confounding together of two most different points. Thirdly, and if the question should be stated of the Minister his duty, that which Mr *Prynne* affirmeth, *viz.* that *the Minister hath fully discharged his duty and conscience, if he give warning to unworthy communicants of the danger they incurre by their unworthy approaches, to the Lords Table, and seriously dehort them from comming to it, unlesse they repent, reforme and come preparedly*; is erroneous and false: for there are other necessary duties incumbent to the Minister, in this businesse: as 1. he must be earnest in his prayers to God, for the conversion and reformation of such unworthy persons, else that God would give his Spirit and assistance to the Eldership, and others to whom the case shall be brought, that they may faithfully doe their duty in restraining such persons: or (if not so) that God would by his owne providence keepe backe such persons, or hedge up their way with thornes, and make a wall, that they shall not finde their pathes to come and prophane the Lords Table. 2. The Minister must deale seriously with the Eldership by informations, exhortations, and admonitions, to move them to doe their duty. 3. The Minister must give his owne vote and sentence in the Eldership against the admission of such persons. 4. If (which God forbid) the Eldership be not willing to doe their duty, but sinfully neglect it, the Minister ought to addresse himselfe with his complaints to the superiour Ecclesiasticall assemblies (as they lie in their order) that they may interpose by their authority, to rectifie the mal-administration of the Congregationall Eldership. 5. And if it should fall out that a scandalous unworthy person should finde so much favour in the higher assemblies also, as that they shall judge him fit to be admitted to the Sacrament; yet if the Minister know him certainly to be a scandalous abominable person, and be also cleere in his conscience, that the matter of scandall is sufficiently proved, he must not doe an unlawfull act in obedience to men,

but

but walke by that Apostolicall rule, 1 *Tim.*5.22. *Be not partaker of other mens sinnes*; *Keep thy selfe pure.* In doing whereof, he doth not make his conscience the rule of inflicting any censure and particularly of suspending from the Sacrament(which must be done ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων *by many*) but yet his conscience so farre as it is informed and illuminate by the word of God, is a rule to him of his owne personall acting or not acting,notwithstanding of which the offender stands *rectus in curia*, and is not excluded by the sentence of any Ecclesiasticall Court. I confesse a Minister ought to be very cleare in his conscience, and be perswaded (not upon suspicions, surmises, or such like sleight motives, but) upon very certaine grounds, that the sentence of an Eldership, Classis, or Synod is contrary to the Word of God,before he refuse to doe the thing.

But what may be the reason why Mr *Prynne* is so large upon this point from pag.28.to 35? I take not upon me to judge *de intentione operantis.* But the *intentio operis* is to yeeld somewhat in lieu of suspension from the Sacrament, which yet shall be no Church censure nor act of jurisdiction, and so to make the discipline of Suspension (yea and Excommunication too) to be of no necessary use in the Church. For if it be sufficient and a full discharge of duty, to admonish unworthy scandalous persons, not to come to the Lords Table, unlesse they repent and reforme, this cuts off the necessity of Censure, whether Suspension or Excommunication. As for that admonition or warning to be given, it is no Church censure, nor act of Jurisdiction, especially when given by the Minister alone; for no Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction can be excercised, or Censure inflicted by any one man, how eminent soever in the Church. Yea when it is a Consistoriall or Presbyteriall Admonition, it is not properly a Censure,but a Degree to Censure. 1.Because Admonition doth not exclude a person from any Church priviledge nor from communion in any Ordinance. And how can one be said to be under Church censure, who still enjoyeth all Church priviledges? 2. If Consistorialladmonition be a binding, where is the loosing of that bond? Every censure consistorially inflicted, must be also consistorially taken off,

off, upon repentance appearing in the party. These things I doe but touch, that I might make it appeare how Mr *Prynnes* doctrine tendeth to strip Elderships out of all jurisdiction or power of Censures. Now come we to the particulars, wherein I doe not finde any great matter to insist long upon.

He first premiseth six conclusions. Supposed conclusions he may make them, but proved Conclusions they are not. The first of them is indeed ushered in syllogistically, but very weakly, as shall appeare. The strength of his discourse he contracteth into this argument.

Those who have a true right to the Sacrament, as visible members of the visible Church, ought not in justice or conscience to be deprived of it, in case they demand it, by any Minister or Presbytery.

But all unexcommunicate Christians, who are able to examine themselves, as visible members of the visible Church, have a true right to the Sacrament, in case they doe demand it, when publiquely administred.

Ergo, they ought not in justice or conscience be deprived of it, by any Minister or Presbytery, when publiquely administred, if they shall require it.

Answ. First, this is *fallacia plurium interrogationum*; for these words, *as visible members of the visible Church*, both in the *Major* and *Minor*, clogge and confound the argument, and patch up two distinct propositions into one.

Secondly, his *Major* cannot be admitted without a distinction. There is *Jus ad rem*, and *Jus in re*. There is a remote right, or a right *in actu primo*, that is, such a right, relation, or habitude as entitleth a person to such a priviledge or benefit, to be enjoyed and possessed by him when he shall be capable and fit to enjoy it: Such is the right of a Minor to his inheritance: Such was the right of lepers of old to their Tents, Houses, and Goods, when themselves were put out of the Camp, and might not (during their leprosie) actually enjoy their own

own habitations: Such is the right which a man hath in *England* to his sequestred Estate, Lands, and Houses; he doth not lose but retaine his Right, Title, Charters and Deeds (as valid in Law, and not made voyd or null) and may be againe admitted to the actuall possession upon satisfaction given to the State: and a huge difference there is between Sequestration, and forfeiture or Outlawry. There is againe a proxime right, or a right *in actu secundo*, which rendereth a person actually and presently capable of that thing which he is entituled unto. If Mr *Prynnes major* be understood of the first kind of right, I deny it. If of the second kind of right, I admit it, and it doth not help his opinion, nor hurt mine.

Thirdly, yea himselfe must needs admit an exception from his *major* proposition, for by his owne principles, those that have a true right to the Sacrament, as visible members of the visible Church, may be excommunicated and so deprived, not onely of the Sacrament, but of all other publique Ordinances. When he tels us here that *nothing but an actuall excommunication can suspend them from this their right*, he doth but begge that which is in question. And if his Argument conclude against a lesser Suspension from their right, why not also against the greater?

Fourthly, he hath not proved his *minor*, especially being understood of the second kind of right, which renders men actually and presently capable of the thing. He saith that the Sacraments were bequeathed by Christ, *to his visible Church on Earth, and all visible members of it.* Which he hath not proved, and I deny it, except it have this limitation, *all visible members of the visible Church, which are (visibly or in externall profession and conversation) qualified according to the rule of Christ, and against whose admission to the Sacrament there is no just exception.*

Fifthly, when he concludeth, that no unexcommunicated Christians who are able to examine themselves (that is, as himselfe hath explained, who are not naturally disabled as children, and fooles: though he shall finde it a very hard taske to prove, that all other unexcommunicate Christians besides these, are

are able to examine themselves) ought in justice or conscience tobe deprived of the Sacrament by any Minister or Presbytery: he doth upon the matter conclude, that the Ordinances of Parliament *Octob.* 20. 1645. and *March* 14. 1645. authorising Presbyteries to suspend from the Sacrament scandalous persons unexcommunicated, are contrary to all justice and conscience. N. B.

Sixthly, as touching that limitation yeelded by himselfe, that they must be such as are able to examine themselves, I aske, 1. Are persons grossely ignorant able to examine themselves? 2. Are drunken persons able to examine themselves? 3. Are men of corrupt minds and erroneous, yea prophane principles, who call evill good, and pervert Scripture to the defending of some grosse sinnes, are these able to examine themselves? 4. Are those who are known that they had never any worke of the law upon their consciences to convince or humble them (*for by the Law is the knowledge of sinne*) able to examine themselves? If the answers be affirmative, then surely this selfe-examination is not rightly apprehended what it is. If the answers be negative; then those who in their addresses to the Lords Table are found ignorant, or drunke, or defenders of sinne, or presumptuous and unconvinced, and doe manifestly appeare such, though they be not excommunicated, and being professed Christians, and desiring the Sacrament, yet ought not to be admitted.

I proceed to his second conclusion, the strength whereof (so farre as I am able to gather from his discourse) may be drawn together into this Argument. Such as in all ages, yea by the very Apostles themselves, have been deemed fit to receive, and could not be denied the Sacrament of Baptisme, ought to be (being baptised and unexcommunicated, and willing to communicate) admitted to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. But in all Churches from Christs time till this present, all externall professors of Christ, even carnall persons, *onely upon a bare externall profession of faith and repentance*, were deemed fit to receive, and were never denied the Sacrament of Baptisme (yea, saith he, *we read in the very Apostles times that a meere externall sleight confession of sinne, and profession of the Christian faith, was*

sufficient to enable sinners to be baptized Ergo, all externall professors of Christ, &c. ought to be admitted to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

Answ. 1. I retort the Argument thus. Such as have been deemed by the Apostles and by all well constituted Churches, unworthy to be admitted to Baptisme, ought also to be deemed unworthy (though baptised) to be admitted to the Lords Supper. But all known wicked and prophane livers, how able and willing so ever to make confession of the true Christian faith, have been by the Apostles and all well constituted Churches deemed unworthy to be admitted to Baptisme. *Ergo*, all known wicked, &c. More of this afterward *Chap.* 13. and *Ch. p.* 15.

Secondly, I answer directly, I distinguish the *Major*, I deny the *Minor*. I distinguish the *Major*: Those who have been admitted to Baptisme ought to be admitted to the Lords Supper *cæteris paribus*, if the proportion hold in the particulars, and if they be as free of scandalous sinnes now when they desire to receive the Lords Supper, as they were when they desired to receive Baptisme. He needed not make so great a matter of our suspending from the Sacrament a person formerly deemed fit to receive Baptisme. For why? the person is a scandalous person now which he was not then. My limitation of *cæteris paribus* he himselfe must admit; otherwise how will he defend his owne Principle, that the flagicious, abominable and obstinate sinners who cannot be reduced by Admonitions, may and ought to be excommunicated, and so to be cut off from the Lords Supper, and all other publike Ordinances, although formerly deemed fit to receive baptisme? The *Minor* I utterly deny as most false and as a reproach cast upon the Apostles themselves. Mr *Prynnes* Rule is so large, that Turkes or Pagans who practically live in Idolatry, common swearing, adultery, drunkennesse, murthering, stealing, or the like, and are known to live in those abominable scandalous sinnes, ought nevertheless *upon a meere externall sleight confession of sinne, and profession of the Christian faith*, be baptised. When I expected his proofe from the Apostles times, he onely tels us that *Philip* baptized *Simon Magus though he were in the gall of bitternesse and bond of iniquity*,

iniquity, Acts 8. *Yea*, saith he, *many other who turned Wolves, Apostates, Hereticks were baptised by the very Apostles, Acts* 20. 2 *Tim.* 3. If he had proved that *Simon Magus* was known to be in the gall of bitternesse and bond of iniquity when *Philip* did baptize him, or that the Apostles did baptise any (upon a sleight externall profession) who were then known to be Wolves, Apostates, and Hereticks, he had said more for his cause then all his booke saith beside. But to tell us that some persons baptized (he might as well have said that some persons who received the Lords Supper did appeare afterward to be in the gall of bitternesse, Wolves, Apostates, Heretickes, is as much as to travell, and to bring forth nothing. For how shall ever this reach the admission of known prophane persons to the Lords Supper? That which he had to prove was the admission (not of hypocrites, but) of knowne scandalous profane persons to Baptisme.

His third conclusion *that it is the Ministers bounden duty to administer the Sacraments to their people, as well as to preach and pray*; no man will deny it, so that the Ministers doe it *debito modo*, and according to the rule of Christ: they are *stewards of the mysteries of God: moreover it is required in stewards that a man be found faithfull*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. It is the bounden duty of Stewards to give the childrens bread to children and not to dogges and swine. It is not the duty of Ministers to preach peace to the wicked, and much lesse to seale it to them who are knowne to be such.

The fourth conclusion, that the Word and Sacraments are set accidentally for the fall and ruine, as wel as for the salvation of men; maketh nothing to the purpose in hand. Whatever the secret intention of God be, and his unsearchable judgement upon the soule of this or that man, it is no rule of duty to the Ministeer or Eldership. *To the Law and to the Testimony. Secret things belong to God.*

The fifth, *that God onely infallibly knows the hearts, and present state of all men*, is no whit neerer the point. The Eldership judgeth of *words* and *works, professions* and *practises. By their fruits ye shall know them.*

The sixth, *that no Ministers private judgement or conscience ought to be the rule of his admitting any to, or suspending them from the Sacrament,* is also wide from the controversie in hand, which is concerning the Elderships (not the Ministers) power. Of the Ministers personall duty I have spoken before.

These six conclusions premised, Mr *Prynne* proceeds to prove, *that a Minister in delivering the Sacrament to a scandalous unexcommunicated person, who after admonition of the danger, doth earnestly desire to receive it, &c. becomes no way guilty of his sinne or punishment, in case he eate or drinke judgement by his unworthy receiving of it.* His first reason, because this receiver *hath a true right to this Sacrament, as a visible member of the visible Church,* is the same thing which I have already answered. His second reason, *because he* (the Minister) *hath no Commission from Christ to keep back such a person,* doth not conclude that the Minister *becomes no way guilty &c.* He had to prove that a Minister hath no commission touching this businesse, but onely to admonish the person of the danger: I hold there are other five duties incumbent to the Minister. Of which before. If any of these duties be neglected, the Minister is guilty. Whether such a person ought to be kept backe is the point in controversie, and therefore he ought not have taken the negative *pro confesso*.

His third reason pag. 33. is the same which was used by [z] *Erastus* as one of his arguments against Excommunication, that the Apostle saith, *Let a man examine himselfe, and so let him eate of that bread, and drink of that cup.* 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Therefore a mans fitnesse or unfitnesse for the Sacrament, is not to be judged by others, but by himselfe onely, and if he judge himselfe fit, the Eldership hath no power to exclude him. The same Scripture is here prest against us by Mr *Prynne* to prove, that if a man *judge himselfe fitly prepared, joynes with others in the publique confession of his sinnes, and promiseth newnesse of life, the Minister* (he should say the Eldership) *ought in point of charity to deem him so, and hath no commission from Christ to exclude him, &c. Let a man therefore examine himselfe, not others, or others him.*

z *Confirm, Thes.* P. g. 120.

I answer, 1. The self-examination there spoken of, is not mentio-

mentioned as exclusive: for it is not said, *Let a man examine himselfe onely.* 2. Yet I can grant it to be exclusive, it being understood of that judging of a mans selfe, which prevents the judgement of God vers. 31. no mans examining of another can doe this, but his examining of himselfe. That which can give us confidence and boldnesse before God, and *assure our hearts before him*, 1 *Joh.* 3. 19. is not the examination or approbation of others, but of our owne conscience; *for what man knowes the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?* 1 *Cor.* 2. 11. The Pastors and Elders of *Corinth* had admitted some to the Lords Table, whom they judged fit and worthy Communicants, but God judged otherwise of them. Therefore saith the Apostle, let a man make a narrow search of his owne conscience, and not rest upon the judgement of others. 3. If it be enough for a man to examine himselfe, by what warrant doth Mr *Prynne* require more, namely, that a man joyn with others in the publique confession of his sinnes, and promise newnesse of life. 4. It is not enough for a notorious scandalous sinner to judge himselfe, nor yet to joyne with others in publique confession: but he must publiquely and particularly confesse his owne sinne, which he must doe personally, or for his own part, and others can not doe it with him. 5. [a] *Augustine* tels us when a man hath examined himselfe, he must also edifie the Church (which before he scandalized) by a publique declaration of repentance for his scandalous sinne. 6. Mr *Prynne* himselfe *Vindic.* pag. 50. will not have an excommunicated person, to be againe received and admitted to the Lords Supper *till publique satisfaction given for the scandall, and open profession of amendment of life, accompanied with externall symptomes of repentance.* And why all this examination should not be required for a prevention of excommunication, yea of suspension, I know not.

[a] *Tom.* 10. *hom.* 50. Et cum in se protulerit severissimæ medicinæ sententiam, veniat ad antistites, per quos illi in Ecclesiâ claves ministrantur, & ranquam bonus incipiens jam esse filius maternorum membrorum ordine custodito, à præpositis sacrorum accipiat satisfactionis suæ modum, ut in offerendo sacrificio cordis contribulati devotus & supplex, id tamen agat, quod non solum illi prosit ad recipiendam salutem, sed etiam cæteris ad exemplum. Ut si peccata ejus non solum in gravi ejus malo, sed etiam in scandalo est aliorum: atque hoc expedire videtur utilitati Ecclesiæ, antistiti in notitia multorum, vel etiam totius plebis agere pæniteniam non recusete.

Mr *Prynnes*

Mr *Prynnes* fourth reason is, because the Minister administers the Sacrament to that scandalous unexcommunicated person, *as to a person outwardly fitted and prepared, the inward preparation of whose heart for ought he knows may be sincere towards God, and really changed from what it was before.* I appeale to every godly Minister, whether this can pacifie or secure his conscience, that a scandalous unexcommunicated person living in known prophanesse and wickednesse, is or may be esteemed a person outwardly fitted and prepared for the Sacrament, yea that the inward preparation of his heart, while he is living in grosse scandalous sinnes, may be sincere towards God and really changed from what it was before: and that th refore he (the Minister) *in delivering the Sacrament to a scandalous unexcommunicated person who after admonition of the danger, doth earnestly desire to receive it, as conceiving himselfe in his owne heart and conscience meet to participate of it, becomes no way guilty, &c?* The Lord save me from that Divinity which holds that a scandalous person in the Church may be admitted to the Lords Supper as a person outwardly fitt d and prepared for that Sacrament.

Fifthly, he argueth from the holinesse and lawfulnesse of administring the Sacrament, and the Ministers good intention to benefit all, and hurt none by it.

Answ. The first part of this reason is a fallacy *ab ignoratione Elenchi:* the point he had to prove was, that the administration of the Sacrament to a scandalous person, is a holy lawfull action. The latter part doth not conclude. A good intention can not justifie a sinfull action.

Sixthly, saith he, *because such a persons unworthy receiving is onely contingent and casuall; no Minister or creature being able infallibly to judge, whether God at this instant, may not by the omnipotent working of his Spirit, &c. change both his heart and his life.*

Answ. 1. By this principle the Minister shall become no way guilty, if he deliver the Sacrament to an Heathen, to an excommunicated person, for the same reason will have place in that case as much as in this, *viz.* God may at the very instant before

before or in the act of receiving change the heart and life of such a Heathen or excommunicate person. 2. A scandalous prophane person his unworthy receiving, is casuall and contingent *in sensu diviso*, but not *in sensu composito*, that is, peradventure God will give him repentance and change his heart and his life, which done, he shall come worthily, and receive worthily: but while he is yet scandalous and neither heart nor life yet changed, his receiving in that estate will certainly be an unworthy receiving: for it implies a contradiction and impossibility, to say that a mans life can be changed while it is not changed, *in sensu composito*, or that a man can be worthy while he is unworthy. 3. It is a most sinfull tempting of the Almighty to cast his word behind us, and then expect the working of Omnipotency for that whereof we have neither promise nor example in the word.

Seventhly, he argueth from our Concessions that Ministers may administer the Sacrament to masked hypocrites, and yet are not guilty of their unworthy receiving. This he saith is a yeelding our objection false in the case of scandalous persons too. But his reason is just as if he had said, Ministers are not guilty when they give the Sacrament to those who are not scandalous. *Ergo*, they are not guilty when they give the Sacrament to those that are scandalous. Or, as if he had argued thus: He that harboureth a Traytor whom he doth not nor cannot know to be such, is not guilty. *Ergo*, he that harboureth a knowne Traytor is not guilty.

Eighthly, (for he hath given his seventh already) he tels us, that *the Minister onely gives the Sacrament, and the unworthy receiving is the receivers own personall act and sinne alone.*

Answ. 1. He begges againe and againe what is in Question. 2. There is an unworthy giving, as well as an unworthy receiving. The unworthy giving is a sinfull act of the Minister, which makes him also accessary to the sinne of unworthy receiving, and so partake of other mens sinnes.

The ninth concerning Christs giving of the Sacrament to *Judas* is answered before.

The tenth I have also answered before in his fourth conclusion.

sion. The Minister is a sweet savour of Christ, as well in those that perish by the Sacrament, as in those that are benefited by
// it, with this *proviso*, that he hath done his duty, as a faithfull Steward, and that he hath not given that which is holy to dogs, else God shall require it at his hands.

Finally, he argueth from 1 *Cor.* 11. 29. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh* (not condemnation but) κρῖμα *judgement*, (meaning some temporall judgement) *to himselfe*) not to the Minister or Communicants.)

Answ. 1. Whatever be meant by judgement in this place, certainly it is a punishment of sinne, and such a thing as proceedeth from Gods displeasure: and it is as certaine that unworthy receiving maketh a person lyable to a greater judgement then that which is temporall. 2. If *to himselfe* be restrictive and exclusive in the case of close hypocrites, such as are by Church-officers (judging according to outward appearance) admitted to the Sacrament; yet how will it be made to appeare that the Apostle meant those words as restrictive and exclusive in the case of scandalous and knowne unworthy communicants. 3. Such a scandalous person doth indeed eate and drink judgement to himselfe; but this can neither in whole nor in part excuse but rather greatly aggravate the sinne of the Minster: for when a wicked man dieth in his iniquity, yet his blood God will require at the hands of the unfaithfull Minister, who did strengthen his hands in his sinne.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Whether the Sacrament of the Lords Supper be a converting or regenerating Ordinance.

I Had in answer to Mr. *Prynns* third *Quære*, given this reason why prophane and scandalous persons are to be kept off from the Sacrament, and yet not from hearing the Word: because the word is not onely a confirming and comforting, but a converting Ordinance, and is a mean appointed of God to turn sinners from darknes to light, and from the power of Sathan to God: Whereas the Sacrament is not a converting, but a confirming and sealing Ordinance, which is not given to the Church for *the conversion of Sinners*, but for *the Communion of Saints*: It is not appointed to put a man in the state of grace, but to seal unto a man that interest in Christ and in the Covenant of Grace which he already hath. Mr. *Prynne* doth with much eagernesse contradict me in this, and argue at length the contrary. (Which is the marrow and fatnesse (if there be any) in his debate concerning the eighth point of difference) Whereby he doth not onely contradict me, but himself too (as shall appear) yea and joyn not onely with the more rigid *Lutherans*, but with the Papists themselves against the Writers of the Reformed Churches. For the very same thing which is controverted between him and me, is controverted between Papists and Protestants. The Papists hold that the Sacraments are instrumental, to confer, give, or work grace; yea *ex opere operato*,

as the School-men speak. Our Divines hold that the Sacraments are appointed of God, and delivered to the Church as sealing Ordinances, not to give, but to testifie what is given, not to make but confirm Saints. And they do not onely oppose the Papists *opus operatum*: but they simply deny this instrumentality of the Sacraments, that they are appointed of God for working or giving grace, where it is not. This is so well known to all who have studied the Sacramentarian controversies, that I should not need to prove it. Yet that none may doubt of it, take here some few instead of many testimonies. ([b]) *Calvin* holds plainly against the Papists that the Sacraments do not give any grace, but do declare and shew what God hath given.

(b) Instit. pag. 301. edit. 1539. *Cum hoc tantum in ministerio habeant (Sacramenta) testificari nobis ac confirmare Dei in nos benevolentiam &c. Ut quæ non largiantur quidem aliquid gratiæ, sed renuncient & ostendant quæ divina largitate nobis data sunt.*

He clears it in that chapter thus, the Sacraments are like seals appended to writs, which of themselves are nothing, if the paper or parchment to which they are appended be blank. Again, they are like pillars to a house which cannot be a foundation, but a strengthening of a house that hath a foundation; We are built upon the Word, the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles. Again, Sacraments are to us from God, that which messengers are which bring good newes from men, they declare what is, but do not so much as instrumentally make it to be. These are *Calvins similes.*

([c]) *Bullinger* confuteth the Popish doctrine concerning the Sacraments conferring of grace, by this principle, that the Saints are justified and sanctified before they are sealed and confirmed by the Sacraments.

(c) Decad. 5. Serm. 7. *Docuit vulgus Sacerdotum & Monachorum Sacramenta novæ legis non tantum esse signa gratiæ, sed simul etiam gratiæ causas, hoc est quæ habeant virtutem conferendi gratiam.* And after. *Sancti & electi Dei non tum primum gratia Dei donisque cœlestibus participant, cum Sacramenta percipiunt. Etenim rebus prius quam signis participant.* And after. *Proinde in Cœna illa non primum accipiuntur divina beneficia, sed pro acceptis aguntur gratiæ. Effecti his opinor, evicique Sacramenta non conferre gratiam.*

d. *Ursinus*

(d) *Ursinus* speaks so fully and plainly for us, that none can say more. He distinguisheth between the Word and Sacraments, as between converting and confirming Ordinances, and argueth that the Sacraments do not confer grace, because we receive not the thing by receiving the signe, but we get the signe because it is supposed we have the thing. Yea he speaks of it as a principle known to children.

(d) Ursin. Tract. Theol. pag. 350. *Sicut verbum est conversionis & confirmationis organum: sic & Sacramenta sunt organa confirmationis &c. Non res accipimus ideo quia signum accipimus: sed signum nobis tribuitur quia res habemus: idque ita, ut non cur habeamus causa, sed quod eas habeamus testimonium sit.* Ibid. de Sacram. defin. quinti Arg. Pag. 557. *Nos vero supra hoc discrimen verbi & Sacramentorum non dissimulavimus, quod fides per verbum incheatur: Sacramentorum usu autem confirmatur, exercetur, fovetur, augetur jam inchoata. Sacramenta enim ne docent quidem, nedum confirmant, nisi præeunte verbo & addente explicationem typorum. Idcirco etiam Sacramenta iis instituta sunt, quos Deus jam pro membris Ecclesiæ a nobis vult agnosci. Inchoatio igitur fidei ordinaria verbi propria est; confirmatio inchoatæ, Sacramentis cum verbo communis est.* Judicium de disciplina Ecclesiastica ad finem Tom. 3 pag. 89. *Quasi non pueris jam notum, verbum & conversis & non conversis esse annunciandum, quo illi quidem confirmentur, hi vero convertantur. Sacramenta autem iis esse instituta qui jam sunt conversi & membra populi Dei facti.*

Wolfangus Musculus in his (e) common places saith thus, *Who seeth not what manner of persons we must be When we approach to this mystical Table of the Lord, to wit, not such as do therein first of all seek the fruition of the body and blood of the Lord, as if we were yet destitute thereof; but such as being already before partakers thereof by faith, do desire to corroborate more and more in our hearts, the grace once received by the Sacramental communication of the body and blood of the Lord, and by the remembrance of his death, and to give thanks to our Redeemer.*

(e) De Cœna Dom. pag. 350 *Quis non videt quales nos ad mysticam hanc Domini mensam accedere oporteat? nempe non tales qui fruitionem corporis ac sanguinis Domini primum in ea quæramus, tanquam illius adhuc expertes: sed qui per fidem illius jam antea participes, gratiam semel acceptam, communicatione hac Sacramentali corporis ac sanguinis Domini, & mortis ipsius rememoratione, in cordibus nostris magis ac magis corroborare, redemptorique gratias agere cupiamus.*

(f) *Martin Bucer* upon *Matth.* 18. 17. puts this difference between the Word preached, and the Lords Supper; that (f) *Adhæc prædicandum iis quoque est, qui nondum audierunt, aut certe nondum perceperunt. Attamen utcunque feratur impuritas conventuum ubi verbum prædicatur, quam Christus & Apostoli quoque tulerunt: Cœnæ tamen communio (ut dixi) purior esse debet. Nam publica est eorum qui palam se Christianos profitentur, de redemptione gratiarum actio: ideo circa hanc, ut communionem Christi solemniter sancti percipiunt, ita excludendi inde sunt qui vita sua se extra hanc communionem esse, manifesto probant.*

the Word may be preached to the unconverted : but the Lords Supper may not be given to any who by their lives do declare that they are out of communion with Jesus Christ. Which is the very point now in controversie.

(g) *Fideles enim ante usum Sacramentorum hanc gratiam omnino habent : neque ad Sacramentorum usum accedere debent qui eam gratiam pro etatis modo non habent, neque admittendi sunt qui eam non habere merito præsumuntur.*

(g) *Festus Honnius Disp.* 43. *Thes.* 3. confuting the Popish opinion of the Sacraments working or giving grace, brings this reason against it; They that receive the Sacraments, have this grace before they receive them, neither are any to be admitted to the Sacraments who may be justly supposed not to be justified and sanctified.

Aretius Coment. in Mark 14. *loc.* 3. observeth, *Qui admissi sint ad istam Cœnam? discipuli solum, Who were admitted to that* (eucharistical) *Supper? the Disciples onely.* Hence he inferreth: *Quare mysteria hæc ad solos fideles pertinent : Wherefore these mysteries do pertain to the faithful alone* : that is, to those who are supposed to be converted and beleevers.

(h) *Quemadmodum autem Sacramenta duplici nomine præstant verbo, itidem verbum duobus nominibus præferendum Sacramentis. Vno quod verbum in adultis & generet fidem, & genitam foveat atque alat : Sacramenta vero eam non gignant, sed tantum genitam conservent atque augeant. Altero quod absque verbo non salvemur. &c.*

Vossius Disp. de Sacram. effic. part. poster. After he hath observed two respects in which the Sacraments do excel the Word. 1. That Infants who are not capable of hearing the Word, are capable of the Sacrament of Baptisme, and are brought to the laver of regeneration. 2. That the Sacraments do visibly and clearly set before our eyes that which is invisible in the Word. He adds (h) *Thes.* 49. other two respects in which the Word doth far excel the Sacraments. 1. That the Word can both beget & confirm faith: the Sacraments cannot beget faith in those that are come to age, but onely conserve and increase it. 2. That without the word we cannot be saved, for he that beleeves not is condemned; now faith commeth by hearing: but the Sacraments though profitable means of grace, yet are not simply necessary.

The confession of the faith of the Church of *Scotland* in the Article entituled *to whom Sacraments appertain*, faith thus. *But the Supper of the Lord we confesse to appertain to such onely as be of the houshold of faith, and can try and examine themselves as well in their faith, as in their duty towards their neighbours.* The *Belgick* Confession *Art.* 33. faith of the Sacraments in generall, that God hath

hath instituted them to seal his promises in us, to be pledges of his love to us; and to nourish and strengthen our Faith. And (i) *Art.* 35. They plainly hold that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is intended and instituted by Christ for such as are already regenerate, and are already quickned with the life of grace.

(i) *Credimus & confitemur Jesum Christum servatorem nostrum sanctæ Cœnæ Sacramentum ordinasse & instituisse, ut ea nutriat & sustentet eos, quos jam regeneravit, &c. At vero, ad conservationem vitæ spiritualis & cœlestis, quam fideles jam habent, Deus illis panem vivificum misit &c.*

The Synod of *Dort* in their Judgement of the fifth Article of the Remonstrants (k) *Sect.* 14. ascribeth both the inchoation and conservation of grace to the Word: but ascribeth onely to the Sacraments the conserving, continuing, and perfecting of that begun grace.

(k) *Quem ad modum autem Deo placuit opus hoc suum gratiæ per predicationem Evangelii in nobis inchoare, ita per ejusdem auditum, lectionem, meditationem, adhortationes, minas, promissa, nec non per usum Sacramentorum, illud conservat, continuat et perficit.*

In the *Belgick* form of the administration of the Lords Supper (See *Corpus Disciplinæ* lately published by the Ministers and Elders of the Dutch Church at *London* pag. 16.) it is said thus. *Those which do not feel this Testimony in their hearts* (concerning their examining of themselves touching their repentance, faith, and purpose of true obedience) *they eat and drink judgement to themselves; Wherefore We also (according to the Commandement of Christ and the Apostle Paul) do admonish all those who find themselves guilty of these ensuing sins, to refrain from comming to the Lords Table, and do denounce unto them that they have no part in the Kingdom of Christ.*

(Here follows an enumeration of diverse scandalous sins concluded with this general, *and all those which lead a scandalous life.*) *All these as long as they continue in such sins, shall refrain from this spiritual food (which Christ onely ordained for his faithful people) that so their judgement and damnation may not be the greater.* Which plainly intimates that they hold this Sacrament to be a sealing, not a converting Ordinance. And this they also signifie, *Ibid. pag.* 17. *And to the end We may firmly beleeve that we do belong to this gracious Covenant, the Lord Jesus in his last Supper took bread. &c.*

(l) Explic. Catech. Quæst. 67. *Verbum est instrumentum Spiritus sancti, per quod inchoat & confirmat in nobis fidem ideoque verbum debet præire. Sacramenta sunt organa Spiritus sancti per quæ fidem inchoatam confirmat: ideoque Sacramenta debent sequi.* Ibid. Quæst. 81. Art. 1. *Sacramenta tantum sunt instituta fidelibus & conversis, ut his promissionem Evangelii obsignent, & fidem confirment. Verbum quidem est conversis, & non conversis commune, ut conversi confirmentur, nondum conversi convertantur: Sacramenta vero ad solos fideles pertinent.*

(l) *Paræus* puts this difference between the Word and Sacraments; that the Word is a mean appointed both for beginning and confirming faith: the Sacraments means of confirming it after it is begun. That the Word belongs both to the converted and to the unconverted: the Sacraments are intended for those who are converted and do beleeve, and for none others.

And though the *Lutherans* make some controversie with us about the effect of the Sacraments, yet (m) *Joh. Gerhardus* doth agree with us in this point, that the Lords Supper is not a regenerating but a confirming and strengthening Ordinance, and this difference he puts between it and Baptisme.

(m) Loc. com. Tom. 5. pag. 1. *Per Baptismum regeneramur ac renovamur: per Sacramentum Cœnæ alimur ac nutrimur ad vitam æternam. In Baptismo præsertim Infantum, per Spiritum S. fides accenditur: in usu sacræ Cœnæ augetur, confirmatur, & obsignatur. Per Baptismum Christo inserimur, in quo spirituale incrementum salutari Cœnæ usu accipimus.*

(n) Tom. 1. pag. 477. *At an non per Sacramenta etiam fides & regeneratio exhibetur?* Resp. *Distinguendum inter primum fidei & resipiscentiæ initium, & confirmationem ejus ac augmentum. Nemo admittitur ad Sacramenta nisi pro fideli & pœnitente habeatur; quemadmodum verba clara sunt,* Quisquis crediderit & baptizatus fuerit. *Infantes habentur pro fœderatis, ac proinde etiam pro iis qui Spiritum fidei acceperunt, sed de hac re postea. Sic in Cœna requiritur, ut homo probet se an sit in fide, & ut digne manducet: infidelibus enim vel nondum credentibus nulla sunt promissiones, ac proinde nec obsignantur. Perperam ergo statuunt ipsa Sacramenta esse causas primæ regenerationis aut justificationis, tum Pontificii, tum Lutherani quidam. Sed si fidei & regenerationis confirmatio & augmentum spectetur, recte tribuitur Sacramentis ut causis instrumentalibus.*

(n) *Walæus* asserteth both against Papists, and against some of the Lutherans, that Sacraments do instrumentally confirme and increase faith and regeneration; but not begin nor work faith and regeneration where they are not.

Petrus Hinkelmannus de Anabaptismo Disp. 9. cap. 1. Error 6. disputeth against this as a Tenent of the *Calvinists. Fideles habent*

habent Spiritum S. habent res signatas ante Sacramenta: the faithful have the holy Spirit, they have the things which are sealed, before they receive the Sacraments. Brochmand. System. Theol. Tom. 3. de Sacram. Cap. 2. Quæst. 1. condemneth this as one of the *Calvinian* errors: *Sacramenta non esse gratiæ conferendæ divinitus ordinata media: that Sacraments are not instituted and appointed of God to be means of conferring or giving grace.* Which he saith is the assertion of *Zuinglius, Beza, Danæus, Musculus, Piscator, Vorstius.* The Lutheran opinion he propounds *ibid. quæst. 6.* that the Sacraments are means appointed of God to confer grace, to give faith, and being given to increase it. *Esthius in Sent. lib. 4. dist. 1. Sect. 9.* stateth the opinion of the *Calvinists* (as he calls us) thus, *justificationem usu Sacramenti esse priorem, obtentam nimirum per fidem quâ homo jam ante credidit sibi remitti peccata; Sacramentum verò postea adhiberi, ut verbo quidem promissionis fides confirmetur: elemento verò ceu sigillo quodam diplomati appenso eadem fides obsignetur; atq; ita per Sacramentum declaretur testatumq; fiat hominem jam prius esse per fidem justificatum.* This he saith is manifestly contrary to the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, from which (saith he) the *Lutherans* do not so far recede as the *Calvinists. Gregorius de Valentia in tertiam partem Thomæ Disp. 3. Quæst. 3. punct. 1.* thus explaineth the Tenent which he holdeth against the Protestants concerning the Sacraments giving of grace. *Sacramenta esse veras causas qualitatis gratiæ, non principales, sed instrumentales: hoc ipso videlicet, quod Deus illis utitur ad productionem illius effectus, qui est gratia, tametsi supra naturam seu efficacitatem naturalem ipsorum.*

The Papists dispute indeed what manner of casuality or vertue it is by which the Sacraments work grace, whether *Phisica*, or *Ethica*; whether *insita*, or *adsita*. In which questions they [illegible] not all go one way. See *Gamachæus in tertiam partem Tho. Quæst. 62. Cap. 5.* But that the Sacraments do work or give grace to all such as do not *ponere obicem*, they all hold against the Protestants. They dispute also whether all the Sacraments give the first grace, or whether Baptisme and Pennance onely give the first habitual grace, and the other five Sacraments (as they make the number) give increase of grace. But in this they all agree, that habitual grace is given in all the Sacraments of the New-

New-Testament: the *Thomists* hold further, that the very first grace is *de facto* given in any of the Sacraments. See for the former (o) *Becanus*, for the latter (p) *Tannerus*.

(o) Becanus Theol. Schol. part. 4. Tract. de Sacram. Quæst. 7. *Omnia Sacramenta novæ legis semper conferunt gratiam habitualem seu justificantem, non ponentibus obicem, ac proinde gratia habitualis est communis quidam effectus omnium Sacramentorum: Est communis sententia.* (p) Tannerus in Thomam. Tom. 4. Disp. 3. Quæst. 3. Dub. 5. *Imo omnia Sacramenta de facto nonnunquam possunt ex opere operato* (how much more if there be also *opus operantis*) *conferre primam gratiam. Hæc est sententia magis pia & probabilior; quam docet S. Thomas &c. eandem communiter sequuntur Thomistæ.* He confirms it thus. *Quia quædam Sacramenta per se proprie solum instituta ad dandam primam gratiam, possunt conferre secundam. Ergo etiam per se instituta ad hanc poterunt conferre primam &c. Atque hoc etiam sensu admitti potest quod nonnulli dixerunt, omnibus Sacramentis sub ratione saltem generica Sacramenti novæ Legis, etsi non specifica, per se convenire ut gratiam primam conferant.*

You will say peradventure, that Protestant Writers hold the Sacraments to be 1. Significant or declarative signes. 2. Obsignative or confirming signes. 3. Exhibitive signes, so that the thing signified is given and exhibite to the soul. I answer, That exhibition which they speak of, is not the giving of grace where it is not (as is manifest by the afore quoted Testimonies) but an exhibition to beleevers, a real effectual lively application of Christ and of all his benefits to every one that beleeveth, for the staying, strengthening, confirming, and comforting of the soul. *Chamierus contractus. Tom. 4. lib. 1. cap. 2. Docemus ergo in Sacramentorum perceptione effici gratiam in fidelibus: & hactenus Sacramenta dicenda efficacia. Polan. Syntag. lib. 6. cap. 49.* saith the visible external thing in the Sacrament, is thus far exhibitive, *quia bona spiritualia per eam fidelibus significantur, exhibentur, communicantur & obsignantur.* So that in this point *Habenti dabitur* is a good rule. *For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. Matth. 25.29.* Our Divines do not say that the Sacraments are exhibitive Ordinances, wherein grace is communicated to those who have none of it, to unconverted or unbeleeving persons.

By this time it may appear (I suppose) that the controversie between us and the Papists concerning the effect of the Sacraments (setting aside the *opus operatum*, which is a distinct contro-

controverſie, and is diſtinctly ſpoken to by our Writers, ſetting aſide alſo the *caſualitas phiſica* and *inſita*, by which ſome of the Papiſts ſay the Sacraments give grace, though diverſe others of them hold the Sacraments to be onely moral cauſes of grace) is thus far the ſame with the preſent controverſie between Mr. *Prynn* and me, that Proteſtant Writers do not onely oppoſe the *opus operatum*, and the *caſualitas phyſica & inſita*, but they oppoſe (as is manifeſt by the Teſtimonies already cited) all caſuality or working of the firſt grace of converſion and faith in or by the Sacraments, ſuppoſing alwaies a man to be a beleever and within the Covenant of grace before the Sacrament, and that he is not made ſuch, nor tranſlated to the ſtate of grace in or by the Sacrament. This the Papiſts contradict, and therein Mr. *Prynn* joyneth with them. When *Bellarmine* brings an impertinent Argument: The Sacraments (ſaith he) have not the ſame relation to faith which the Word hath: *Nam verbum Dei præcedit fidem, Sacramenta autem ſequuntur, ſaltem in adultis. The Word of God doth go before faith, but the Sacraments follow after it, at leaſt in thoſe who are of age. Dr. Ames Bell. enerv. Tom. 3. lib. 1. cap. 5.* corrects his great miſtake or oblivion. *Hoc illud eſt quod nos docemus: Sacramenta confirmare fidem per verbum Dei prius ingeneratam, ſaltem in adultis. This* (ſaith he) *is that which we teach, that the Sacraments confirm that faith which was firſt begotten by the Word of God, at leaſt in thoſe who are of age.*

Mr. *Prynns* aſſertion is, that the Lords Supper is a converting, as well as a ſealing Ordinance; for clearing whereof he premiſeth two diſtinctions. There are two ſorts both of converſion and ſealing, which he ſaith his Antagoniſts *to delude the vulgar have ignorantly, wilfully, or injudiciouſly confounded.* Whether ſuch language beſeems a man fearing God, or honouring them that do fear God, let every one judge who knoweth any thing of Chriſtian moderation. See now if there be any reaſon for this grievous charge. *Firſt* (ſaith he) *there is an external converſion of men from Paganiſme or Gentiliſme to the external profeſſion of the faith of Chriſt.* This (he ſaith) is wrought by the Word or by Miracles, and effected by Baptiſme in reference to infants of Chriſtian Parents. But how the Baptiſme

of such Infants is brought under the head of conversion from Paganisme to the external profession of Christ, I am yet to learn. *Secondly* saith he, *There is a conversion from a meer external formal profession of the Doctrine and Faith of Christ, to an inward spiritual embracing and application of Christ with his merits and promises to our souls, by the saving grace of Faith, and to an holy Christian real change of heart and life: In this last conversion, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is not onely a sealing or confirming, but likewise a regenerating and converting Ordinance as well as the Word.*

He might upon as good reason have made a third sort of conversion from a scandalous and prophane life to the external obedience of the will and commandements of God. But all this is to seek a knot in the rush; for there is but one sort of conversion which is a saving conversion, and that is a conversion from nature to grace, from sin to sanctification, from the power of Sathan to God, whether it be from paganisme, or from prophaneneſſe, or from an external formal profession. Now that conversion which Mr. *Prynn* ascribes to the Sacrament is a true sanctifying and saving conversion. The other conversion which he ascribes not to the Sacrament, is not a saving conversion, for the *external conversion of men from Paganisme or Gentilisme to the external profession of the faith of Christ*, without the other conversion to an inward spiritual embracing of Christ, doth but make men seven-fold more the children of Hell. So that Mr. *Prynn* hath more opened his sore when he thought to cover and patch it.

The other distinction which he gives us, is of a twofold sealing. But by the way he tells us that Baptisme and the Lords Supper are termed Sacraments and Seals, without any Text of Scripture to warrant it. Hereby as he gratifieth (q) the *Socinians* not a little (who will not have the Lords Supper to be cal-

(q) Faustus Socinus de Cœna Dom. Tract. brev.

terum, quod omnes fere opinantur, hoc ritu, quem Sacramentum appellant, confirmari saltem fidem nostram, ne id quidem verum censeri debet; cum nec ullo sacro testimonio comprobetur, nec ulla ratio sit, cur id fieri possit. Quomodo enim potest nos in fide confirmare id quod nos ipsi facimus, quodque licet a Domino institutum, opus tamen nostrum est. Smalc. Disp. 12. de Cœna. *Vox Sacramenti in hac significatione barbara vel saltem sacris literis incognita est, ab hominibus vero otiosis, qui ceremoniis hujusmodi nescio quid præter sacram Scripturam superstitiosum aut etiam Idololatricum ex parte, tribuere non sunt veriti, ad tegendum dolum usurpata.*

led

led either seal or Sacrament, but an obediential act and a good work of ours, and tell us that we make the Lords Supper but too holy to delude the vulgar) So he correcteth all Orthodox Writers, Ancient and Modern. The Apostle describeth Circumcision to be σφραγὶς a seal of the righteousnesse of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. Whence Divines give the name of seals to all Sacraments. *Rectè autem* (saith *Aretius Theol. Probl. Loc.* 76.) *speciebus imis & intermediis generibus eadem assignantur in definiendo genera.* Circumcision is a seal, therefore a Sacrament is a seal: as well as this, Justice is a habit, therefore vertue is a habit. Man is a substance, therefore a living creature is a substance. And further, if Circumcision was a seal; the Lords Supper is much more a seal; as we shall see afterwards. The honourable Houses of Parliament, after advice had with the 9 Assembly of Divines have judged this point (which Mr. *Prynn* so much quarrelleth) to be not onely true, but so far necessary and fundamental, that in their Ordinance of *October* 20. 1645. for keeping back the ignorant and the scandalous from the Sacrament, this truth, *That the Sacraments are seals of the Covenant of grace*, is enumerate among those points of Religion, which all persons who shall be admitted to the Lords Supper ought to know, and of which whosoever is ignorant shal not be admitted to the Lords Supper. I hope Mr. *Prynn* shall not be willing to fall within the Category of ignorant persons, and such as ought not be admitted to the Sacrament: which yet by that Ordinance he must needs do; if he will not know the Lords Supper to be a seal of the Covenant of grace. Wherefore though he leaneth much that way, both here, and pag. 30. yet I shall expect he will rectifie himself in this particular. His words are these. *There is a double sealing* (*if we admit this Sacrament or Baptisme to be seals, though never once stiled seals in any Scripture Text*) And in the Margent, *they are termed Sacraments and seals of the Covenant, without any Text to warrant it.* Now *Quæritur* whether Mr. *Prynn* doth know that the Sacraments are seals of the Covenant of grace; and if he doth not know this, whether doth not the Ordinance strike against him. And now to return, the word σφραγὶς, that is, *a Seal*; (which makes most to our present purpose) is a Scripture word. As for the Word *Sacrament*, we

need not seek it in Scripture, because it is a Latin Word, and there is not either in the Hebrew or Greek (the languages in which Scripture was written) any word which properly, closely and fully answereth to the Word Sacrament. Sure we have *the thing Sacrament* (though not the *name*) in Scripture. Peradventure Mr. *Prynn* is the more afraid of the Word *Sacrament*, because some derive it *à sacra mente*, which suteth not so well to his notion of a converting Ordinance.

Well: But what are his two sorts of sealing? 1. *A visible external sealing of the pardon of sin and Gods promises in the blood of Christ to our outward senses.* 2. *An internal invisible sealing of them by the Spirit, working in, by the Word and Sacraments to our souls. In the first sence* (he saith) *this Sacrament is a seal to all receivers, even to those who are scandalous and unworthy, who receive onely the outward Elements.* Again this first kind of sealing (saith he) *seals all Gods promises and a free pardon of all our sins onely conditionally, if We truly repent, lay hold on Christ &c.* The second which is an absolute sealing, he grants to belong onely to worthy penitent beleeving receivers. Who doth now delude the vulgar? When the Lords Supper is called a sealing Ordinance; did ever any man understand this of a sealing to our outward sences onely, or of receiving the outward Elements and no more? Who can mistake the thing so far as to think that Christ hath instituted and ordained this Sacrament to be a meer external seal and no more? When he grants that in the second sence this Sacrament is a seal, *onely to worthy, penitent, beleeving receivers, Who receive the inward invisible grace, as Well as the outward signes:* He grants that which I require, that is, that it is a sealing Ordinance intended for worthy penitent beleeving receivers, not for the scandalous and unworthy. God forbid we should make a sealing Ordinance to be an empty Ordinance. The truth is, his first kind of sealing without the second, is no sealing, yea worse then no sealing. Where there is no charter, how can there be a sealing, except we seal blank paper? and as we shall hear anon from *Chrysostome*, we have not so much as the seal, except we have that which is sealed. I know it will be answered, there is somewhat to be sealed even to the scandalous and unworthy; that is, the pardon of all their sins conditionally,

tionally, if they truly repent, beleeve, lay hold on Christ. In this very place Mr. *Prynn* tells us, that all Gods promises and a free pardon is sealed, even to scandalous and unworthy receivers conditionally; that is, as he explicates himself pag 37. upon condition that they *become penitent and beleeving receivers.* But then (say I) he must upon as good reason grant, that the Sacrament may be given to Pagans and Turks, at least the first day of preaching the Gospel to them; May it not be said to Pagans and Turks, that if they repent and beleeve on Christ, they shall have pardon of sin? Here is the thing to be sealed in Mr. *Prynn*'s opinion. What then should hinder the sealing? He shunneth to call the Sacrament a converting ordinance in reference to Pagans; and now behold his principles will admit the giving of the Sacrament even to Pagans as a sealing Ordinance, how much more then as a converting Ordinance?

We have now heard his two distinctions, which if they have given any clearing to his assertion, it is such as is little to his advantage. I will now premise some distinctions of my owne to clear that which I hold.

1. The Question is not *de potentia Dei absoluta*, Whether God by his omnipotency can give the first grace of conversion in the instant of receiving the Sacrament. But the Question is of the revealed will of God, and the way of the dispensation of grace made known to us in the Gospel, which must be the rule to us to walk by. *A peradventure it may be*, and *Who knoweth* but the scandalous sinner *may* be converted, is no warrantable ground to go upon in this case, as Mr. *Prynn* would make it pag. 47. for we may as well adventure to delay repentance, upon a *peradventure it may be.* There is an example in the New-Testament of one who got repentance and mercy at his end, and if we beleeve the Hebrews and divers Christian Interpreters; there is another example of the same kind in the Old Testament, which is the example of *Achan.* Whereas there is no example in all the Scripture of any converted by the Sacrament. But if a thing be contrary to the revealed will and commandement of God (as both these are, the delaying of repentance, and the admission of scandalous persons to the Sacrament) we may not dare to go upon *peradventures. To the Law, and to the Testimony. Search the*

Scriptures. If the Word do not shew us any thing of conversion by the Sacrament, we must not think of any such thing.

2. We must distinguish between the Sacrament it self, and those things that do accompany the Sacrament, powerful preaching, exhortation, prayer, or the like before or after the Sacrament. Put case a sinner be effectually converted by a Sermon or a prayer, which he heareth at the Ordination of a Minister, will any man therefore say that Ordination is a converting Ordinance? So if by most serious powerful exhortations, convictions, promises, threatnings, by prayer, by Christian conference by reading or meditation before or after the Sacrament, the Lord be pleased to touch the Conscience and convert the soul of an impenitent prophane wicked liver, nothing of this kind can make the Sacrament a converting Ordinance.

3. We must distinguish even in conversion between *gratia praeveniens & subsequens*, *operans & co-operans*, *excitans & adjuvans*, or rather, between *habitual* and *actual* conversion. *Habitual* conversion I call the first infusion of the life and habits of grace; *actual* conversion is the souls beginning to act from that life and from those habits. The first or habitual conversion in which the sinner is passive, and not at all active, it being wholy the work of preventing, exciting, quickning grace, is that which never is to be looked for in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is enough to overthrow that opinion, that scandalous impenitent sinners (having an external formal profession, but known by a wicked abominable conversation to be dead in sins and trespasses, in whom the holy Ghost hath never yet breathed the first breath of the life of grace) may be admitted to the Lords Supper (if they desire it, not being excommunicated) upon hopes, that it may prove a converting Ordinance to them. As for *gratia subsequens co-operans & adjuvans*, by which the sinner (having now a spiritual life created in him and supernatural habits infused in his soul) is said actually to convert, repent, and beleeve. I consider even in this actual conversion, repenting, beleeving, these two things. 1. The inchoation. 2. The progresse of the work. Where the work is begun, if it were but faith like a grain of mustard seed, and where there is any thing of conversion which is true and sound; the Sacrament is a blessed powerful means

means to help forward the work. But I peremptorily deny that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is appointed or instituted by Christ as a regenerating converting Ordinance, as well as the word, or as a means of beginning *actual*, much lesse *habitual* conversion.

4. When I hold the Lords Supper not to be a converting but a sealing Ordinance, the meaning is not as if I beleeved that all who are permitted to come to the Lords Table are truly converted, or that they are such as the seals of the Covenant of Grace do indeed and of right belong unto (for we speak of visible Churches and visible Saints) But my meaning is that Christ hath intended this Sacrament to be the childrens bread onely (though the hired servants of the house have other bread enough and to spare) and he alloweth this portion to none but such as are already converted and do beleeve: and that they who are the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God ought to admit none to this Sacrament, except such as are quallified and fit (so far as can be judged by their profession, knowledge, and practice, observed and examined by the Eldership according to the rules of the Word, no humane court being infallible) to have part and portion in the communion of Saints, and to receive the seals of the Covenant of Grace, at least that they may not dare to admit any man whose known and scandalous wickednesse continued in without signes of repentance, saith within their heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes.

These things premised (which are to be remembred by the Reader, but need not be repeated by me as we go along) I proceed to the Arguments which prove my assertion, that the Lords Supper is not a converting but a sealing Ordinance. And thereafter I shall answer Mr. *Prynns* Arguments brought to the contrary.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Twenty Arguments to prove that the Lords Supper is not a converting Ordinance.

First,

THat which is an institute significant signe, to declare and testifie the being of that thing which is thereby signified, is not an operating cause or mean which makes that thing signified to begin to be where it was not. But the Sacrament is an instituted signe to declare and testifie the being of that thing which is thereby signified. *Ergo,*

This is an Argument used by [r] Protestant writers against Papists. The *Sacraments* being by their definition *Signes*, are not causes of that which they signifie, neither are the things signified the effects of the Sacraments. Wherefore the Sacrament of the Lords Supper being a signe of our spiritual life, faith, union with Christ, and remission of sins, is not instituted to convey these spiritual blessings to such as have them not. *Significancy* is one thing, *efficiency* another. You will say by this Argument there is no grace exhibited nor given to beleevers themselves in the Sacrament.

(r) Chamier. contract. Tom 4. lib. 2. cap. 9. *Quia ut efficientia toto genere suo differt a significatione: ita diversa ratio est instituendi instrumenta efficientia, & significantia &c. 2. prob. inductione. Quia nulla signa sive miraculosa, sive alia, sunt efficientia.*

Answ. Growth in grace and confirmation of Faith is given to beleevers in the Sacrament, which the significancy hinders not, becaule the Sacrament doth not signifie nor declare

Polanus Synt. lib. 6. cap. 49. *Elementum Sacramentale significat, testatur, & obsignat credentibus rem verbo Dei promissam, eam autem nequaquam causat, efficit, aut producit.*

that

that the receiver hath much grace and a ſtrong faith; but that he hath ſome life of grace and ſome faith. The very ſtate of grace or ſpiritual life, regeneration, faith and remiſſion of ſins are ſignified, declared, teſtified, and ſealed, but not wrought or given in the Sacrament. The ſtrengthening of faith and a further degree of communion with Chriſt is not ſignified in the Sacrament, I mean, its not ſignified that we have it, but that we ſhall have it, or at moſt that we do then receive it. So that beleevers may truly be ſaid to receive at the Sacrament a confirmation or ſtrengthening of their faith, or a further degree of communion with Chriſt: but it cannot be ſaid that the very Sacramental act of eating or drinking, being a ſigne of ſpiritual life and union with Chriſt (as that which we have, not which we ſhall have, or at that inſtant receive) is a mean or inſtrumental cauſe to make a man have that which it teſtifieth or ſignifieth he hath already. There is no evaſion here, for one who acknowledgeth the Sacrament to be a ſigne, declaring or ſhewing forth that we have faith in Chriſt, remiſſion of ſins by him, and union with him. Mr. *Prynn* muſt either make blank the ſignification of the Sacrament *à parte ante*, though not *à parte poſt*, or elſe hold that the ſignification of the Sacrament, is not applicable to many of thoſe whom he thinks fit to be admitted to receive it.

Secondly, That which neceſſarily ſuppoſeth converſion and faith, doth not work converſion and faith. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper neceſſarily ſuppoſeth converſion and faith. *Ergo.*

The propoſition is ſo certain, that either it muſt be yeelded, or a contradiction muſt be yeelded: for that which worketh converſion and faith, cannot ſuppoſe that they are, but that they are not. Therefore that which ſuppoſeth converſion and faith, cannot work converſion and faith, becauſe then the ſame thing ſhould be ſuppoſed both to be and not to be. The Aſſumption I prove from Scripture. *Mark.* 16. 16. *He that beleeveth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved. Act.* 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized. verſ.* 41. *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized. Act.* 8. 36. 37. *And the Eunuch ſaid, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou beleeveſt with all thine heart thou mayeſt. Act.* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water that*

these should not be baptized which have received the holy Ghost as well as we?

Now if Baptisme it self (which is the Sacrament of our initiation) supposeth (according to the tenor and meaning of Christs institution) that the party baptized (if of age) doth actually convert and beleeve, and (if an infant) supposeth an interest in Jesus Christ and in the Covenant of grace (for if he be a child of an Heathen or an Infidel although taken into a Christian Family, yet the Synod of *Dort. Sess.* 19. adviseth not to baptize such a child, till it come to such age as to be instructed in the principles of Christian Religion.) How much more doth the Lords Supper, necessarily, by Christs institution, suppose that the receivers are not unconverted and unbeleeving persons? The previous qualifications which are supposed in Baptisme, must be much more supposed in the Lords Supper.

Thirdly, That which gives us the new food, supposeth that we have the new birth and spiritual life, and that we are not still dead in sins and trespasses. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper gives us the new food. *Ergo* it supposeth we have the new birth. The proposition I prove thus. [f] A man must first be born by the new birth, before he can be fed with the new food: and how can a man eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ, and yet be supposed not to have a spiritual life before that act, but to get a spiritual life in that very act? Doth a man get life because he eats and drinks, or doth he not rather eat and drink because he lives? The Assumption is a received and uncontroverted truth. And hence do Divines give this reason why we are but once baptized, but do many times receive the Lords Supper; because it is enough to be once born, but not enough to be once nourished or strengthened. See the *Belgick* confession *Art.* 34. and D. *Parei Miscellanea Catechetica pag.* 79. I shall strengthen my Argument by the Confession of *Bohemia Cap.* 11. *The Sacraments cannot give to any such* (which before was not inwardly quickened by the holy Ghost) *either grace or justifying and quickening faith, and therefore they cannot justifie any man,*

(f) Synops. Pur. Theol. Disp. 43. Thes. 35. Duo tantum esse & non plura (Sacramenta) affirmamus: quoniam unum est initiationis, seu regenerationis, alterum nutritionis seu alimoniæ. So Matthias Martinius lexic. Philol. pag. 3272 *makes this distinction between baptisme and the Lords Supper: that is a Sacrament of initiation and adoption: this of confirmation and nourishment.*

nor

nor inwardly quicken or regenerate any mans Spirit: for faith must go before. And after. *For if a dead man or one that is unworthy do come to the Sacraments, certainly they do not give him life and worthinesse. &c.* See the *Harmony of Confessions* printed at *London* 1643. *pag.* 280. 281. To what end then is the Sacrament of the Lords Supper instituted? For that, see the Confession of *Belgia Ibid. pag.* 320. *We beleeve and confesse that Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour hath instituted the holy Sacrament of his Supper, that in it he might nourish and sustain those whom he hath regenerated and ingrafted into his Family, which is the Church.* Both these Chapters did Mr. *Prynn* cite in the Question of *Judas* (which yet prove not what he affirmeth in that point, as I have noted before) but it seems he did not observe these passages, which make directly against him in this Question of conversion or conferring of grace by the Sacrament. I add also Mr. *Pemble* in his Christian directions for receiving the Sacrament. *The Sacrament* saith he *is appointed for our nourishment in grace; where we grow not by it, it is a signe this food was not digested but vomited up again. Where faith, repentance, thankfulnesse, and obedience are not increased, there Christ crucified was not remembred.* But how can there be any nourishment in grace, or any increase of grace in those who come to the Sacrament, without the first grace, or in the state of unregeneration?

Fourthly, That Ordinance which is instituted onely for beleevers and justified persons, is no converting but sealing Ordinance. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is instituted onely for beleevers and justified persons. *Ergo.* The Proposition hath light enough in it self; for converting Ordinances do belong even to unjustified and unconverted persons. Therefore that which is instituted onely for beleevers is no converting Ordinance. All the Question will be of the Assumption, which I shall the rather confirm, because it is the very principle from which (t) *Polanus* and others argue for the suspension of scan-

(t) Polan. Synt lib. 6 cap. 56.

He holds that *omnes illi qui scandala præbent & non resipiscunt serio, a mensa Domini sunt arcendi.* 1. *Quia si infideles & impœnitentes ad Cœnam Domini admitterentur, profanaretur fœdus Dei, tam communicando Symbola fœderis iis quibus Deus nihil promittit, quam usurpando Symbola sacra sine fide & resipiscentia.* 2. *Quia polluerent & contaminarent cibum & potum consecratum quem Christus non destinavit nisi suis domesticis & fidelibus &c.* 6. *Quia incredulos & manifeste impios Christus prohibuit admitti ad sacram Cœnam: nam instituit illam solis fidelibus.*

dalous persons from the Lords Table. Now I prove the Assumption thus. Every Sacrament, even a Sacrament of initiation, is *a seal of the righteousnesse of Faith.* If Circumcision was *a seal of the righteousnesse of faith. Rom.* 4. 11. then Baptisme (which hath succeeded to Circumcision) is also *a seal of the righteousnesse of faith*, and that more fully and clearly then Circumcision was: and if Baptisme be *a seal of the righteousnesse of faith*, much more is the Sacrament of the Lords Supper *a seal of the righteousnesse of Faith*; which is also proved by *Mat.* 26. 28. *For this is my blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Chrysostome* on *Rom.* 4. considering those words *vers.* 11. *a seal of the righteousnesse of Faith*, hath this meditation upon it, that a Sacrament is no signe, no seal, except where the thing is which is signified and sealed τίνος γὰρ ἔσται σημεῖον, τίνος δὲ σφραγὶς, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ σφραγιζομένῳ, *For of what shall it be a signe, or of what shall it be a seal, when there is none to be sealed.* εἰ γὰρ δικαιοσύνης ἐστὶ σημεῖον, δικαιοσύνην δὲ οὐκ ἔχεις, οὐδὲ σημεῖον ἔχεις. *For* (faith he) *if it be a signe of righteousnesse, and thou hast not righteousnesse, neither hast thou the signe.* If therefore a Sacrament be a seal of the righteousnesse of faith, then it is instituted onely for beleevers and justified persons, because to such onely it can seal the righteousnesse of faith. Upon this ground faith (u) *Ursinus* that the Sacraments are to the wicked and unbeleevers no Sacraments: which agreeth with that *Rom.* 2. 25. *If thou be a breaker of the Law, thy Circumcision is made uncircumcision.*

(u) Ubi supra pag. 395.

Fifthly, The Apostle argues that *Abraham* the father of the faithfull, and whose justification is as it were a pattern of ours, was not justified by Circumcision, or (as *Aquinas* confesseth upon the place) that Circumcision was not the *cause* but the *signe* of Justification. *Rom.* 4. 9. 10. 11. *We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousnesse. How was it then reckoned? When he was in Circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in Circumcision but in uncircumcision. And he received the signe of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousnesse of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised* (x) If *Abraham* the father of the faithful, got not so much

(x) Bullinger Decad. 5. serm. 7. *Quis praterea inde non colligat, nos qui filii Abrahæ sumus, non alia ratione justificari, quam patrem justificatum constat, ac Sacramenta nostra in nobis non aliud efficere, quam quod in illo effecerunt? præsertim cum eadem sit ratio Sacramentorum veterum & nostrorum.*

as the Sacrament of initiation, till after he was justified and sanctified, how shall we think of receiving, not onely the Sacrament of initiation, but the Sacrament of spiritual nourishment, while unjustified and unsanctified? And if God did by his Word make a Covenant with *Abraham*, before he received Circumcision the seal of that Covenant, must it not much more be supposed, that they are within the Covenant of grace, who eat and drink at the Lords Table, and consequently, that those who are children of disobedience and wrath, and strangers to Christ and the Covenant of Grace (apparently and manifestly such, though not professedly) ought not to be admitted to the Lords Table under colour of a converting Ordinance, it being indeed a seal of the Covenant of grace.

Sixthly, That Ordinance which is appointed onely for such as can and do rightly examine themselves concerning their spiritual estate, regeneration, repentance, faith, and conversation: is no converting Ordinance. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is an Ordinance which is appointed onely for such as can and do rightly examine themselves concerning their spiritual estate, regeneration, repentance, faith, and conversation. *Ergo*, it is no converting Ordinance. The reason of the Proposition is, because unconverted persons cannot nor do not rightly examine themselves concerning their spiritual estate, regeneration, &c. For such are *a generation pure in their own eyes, and yet not washed from their filthinesse. Proverb.* 16. 2. and 21. 2. and 30. 12. and the natural man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God, *because they are spiritually discerned, But he that is spiritual judgeth all things.* 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. 15. *The carnal mind is enmity against God. Rom.* 8. 7. The Assumption is proved by 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that Cup.* This self-examination (Interpreters say) must be concerning a mans knowledge, (y) repentance, faith, and conversation. The Apostle expounds himself 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Examine your selves whether ye be in the Faith:*

(y) Synopf. pur. Theol. Disp. 45. Thes. 83. *Dignus ejus usus præeunte probatione sui cujusque definitur: scilicet an sit in fide* 2 Cor. 13. 5. *& seria resipiscentia afficiatur, secundum illud Pauli, Probet vero seipsum homo. &c.*

prove your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates, or *counterfeit*, and unapproved. This self examination, as it is requisite at other times, so especially before our comming to the Lords Table; and an unconverted man can no more do it truly and rightly (according to the Apostles meaning) then he can convert himself. And here that which Mr. *Prynn* did object, maketh against himself; the Apostle saith, *Let a man examine himself*, not others; for the examination there spoken of belongs to the Court of a mans own Conscience, and to the inward man saith *Martyr* upon the place, not to the Ecclesiastical Court. But a natural unconverted man may possibly examine others and espie a mote in his brothers eye, he cannot in any right or acceptable manner examine his own Conscience, nor go about the taking of the beam out of his own eye. [z] He therefore who either cannot through ignorance, or doth not through impenitency and hardnesse of heart, examine himself, and is known to be such a one by his excusing, justifying, or not confessing his scandalous sin, or continuing in the practice thereof, ought not to be admitted to that holy Ordinance which is instituted onely for such as can and do humbly and soundly examine themselves, and consequently not intended for unconverted impenitent persons.

(z) Ursinus Tract. Theol. pag. 650. edit. 1584. *Ad Cœnam Domini autem nulli nisi adulti, qui & probare seipsos possunt, & hanc probationem confessione & vita ostendant. Quid porro de his faciendum qui vitam Christianis indignam agunt? Ecclesiastica disciplina coercendi sunt.*

Seventhly, That Ordinance unto which one may not come without a wedding garment, is no converting Ordinance. But the Supper of the Lord, the marriage feast of the Kings son, is an Ordinance unto which one may not come without a wedding garment. *Ergo.* The Proposition hath this reason for it. If a man must needs have a wedding garment that comes, then he must needs be converted that comes; for what-ever ye call the wedding garment, sure it is a thing proper to the Saints, and not common to unconverted sinners, and the want of it doth condemn a man into utter darknes, *Matth.* 22. 13. The Assumption is clear from *Matth.* 22. 11. 12. *When the King came in to see the Guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment. And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? and he was speechlesse.* If he had been of Mr. *Prynns* opinion he needed not be speechlesse; for Mr. *Prynns* divinity might have put this answer in his mouth,

Lord

Lord I thought this to be a converting Ordinance, and that thou wouldeſt not reject thoſe that come in without a wedding garment, provided that here at the marriage feaſt they get one. But we ſee the King condemneth the man for comming in thither without a wedding garment.

Eightly, That Ordinance which is not appointed to work faith is no converting ordinance. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is not appointed to work faith. *Ergo.* The propoſition muſt be granted, unleſſe a man will ſay that converſion may be without faith. The Aſſumption is proved by *Rom.* 10. 14. men cannot pray if they do not beleeve, and they cannot beleeve if they do not hear the Word, *v.* 17. *So then faith commeth by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.* If faith commeth by hearing, then not by ſeeing; if by the word, then not by the Sacrament.

Ninthly, That Ordinance which hath neither a promiſe of the grace of converſion annexed to it, nor any example in the Word of God of any converted by it, is no converting Ordinance. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper hath neither a promiſe of the grace of converſion annexed to it, nor is there any example in all the Scripture of any ever converted by it. Therefore it is no converting Ordinance.

Tenthly, That Ordinance whereof Chriſt would have no unworthy perſon to partake is not a converting Ordinance. But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance whereof Chriſt would have no unworthy perſon to partake. *Ergo.* The propoſition I prove thus. It is not the will of Chriſt that converting Ordinances ſhould be diſpenced to no unworthy perſon (for elſe how ſhould they be converted) but onely he hath forbidden to diſpence unto unworthy perſons ſuch Ordinances as belong to the Communion of Saints. The Aſſumption I prove from 1 *Cor.* 11. 27. *Whoſoever* (though otherwiſe a worthy perſon & one converted to the ſtate of grace) *ſhall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, ſhal be guilty of the body & blood of the Lord.* v. 29. *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lords body.* If the unworthines of that particular act, in reſpect of the manner of doing it, make a man ſo guilty and liable to ſuch judgement, how much more the unworthineſſe of the perſon that eats and drinks? For a

mans

mans state, the course of his life, and the frame of his Spirit, is more then one single act. This therefore doth prove that he that is an unworthy person (if he come to the Lords Table) doth eat and drink unworthily (Whence is that where the Apostle saith *vers. 29. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily*, the Syriack Interpreter hath it, *he that eateth and drinketh thereof being unworthy*, or *indignus existens*:) Which i may be also gathered from the interweaving of vers. 28. between vers. 27. and vers. 29. He that eats and drinks, not having before rightly examined himself, eats and drinks unworthily. But he that is an unworthy person, and comes to the Lords Table unworthily and unpreparedly, eats and drinks not having before rightly examined himself. *Ergo.* What of that? will you say. [a] Much to the point. Every unconverted and unregenerate person is an unworthy person (as the Scripture distinguisheth worthy persons and unworthy) and comes unworthily and unpreparedly (if he come while such) to the Lords Table; Therefore such a one if he come, eats and drinks unworthily, and so eats and drinks judgement to himself. [b] *Augustine* argueth promiscuously against those who come unworthily, and those that eat and drink unworthily, and applyeth the Apostles words of eating and drinking unworthily, to all who come with polluted souls, such as all unconverted have. And *Gualther*, *Martyr*, and other Interpreters upon the place, the Centurists also in the place last cited, reckon those to eat and drink unworthily, who come without the wedding garment, and without faith, and holiness of conversation, which intimateth that they who live unworthily, do also eat the Lords Supper unworthily, which is most plainly intimate in the *Directory* pag. 50. where ignorant, scandalous, and prophane persons are warned not to come to that holy Table, upon this reason, because he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks judgement to himself, which

(a) Magdeb. Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 4. pag. 278. *Indigne eos uti docet (Paulus) qui non probant seipsos: hoc est qui sine vera pœnitentia & fide accedunt. &c.* Oecumenius upon 1 *Cor* 11. *fixeth the sin of eating and drinking unworthily upon the* Corinthians, *in regard of their contempt of the poor, and their other sinnes: supposing all such to eat unworthily who are under any wickedness unrepented, when they come.*

(b) De Tempore Serm. 244. *Et cum nullus homo velit cum tunica sordibus plena ad Ecclesiam convenire, nescio qua Conscientia cum anima per luxuriam sit inquinata, præsumit ad altare accedere: non timens illud quod Apostolus dixit: Qui enim manducat Corpus & sumit sanguinem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis & sanguinis Domini.*

necessarily

necessarily implyeth that unworthy persons and prophane livers, if they come to the Sacrament, are not converted, but sin more in eating and drinking unworthily. I conclude therefore that the prohibition of eating and drinking unworthily doth necessarily imply a prohibition of unconverted, unregenerate, impenitent persons, to come to the Lords Table, and by consequence that it is no converting Ordinance.

Eleventhly, That Ordinance which is Eucharistical and consolatory, supposeth that such as partake of it have part and portion in that thing for which thanks are given, and are such as are fit to be comforted. But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance Eucharistical and consolatory. *Ergo.* The Proposition needs no other proof but the third Commandement; *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.* Shall a man be called to give thanks for redemption, reconciliation, and remission of sins, and to take comfort in Jesus Christ, even while he is such a one of whom God hath said, *There is no peace to the Wicked: High talk becommeth not a fool. Psal.* 33. 1. *Rejoyce in the Lord O ye righteous, for praise is comely for the upright. Psal.* 50. 14. 16. *Offer unto God thanksgiving &c. But unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my Covenant in thy mouth.* [c] The Assumption is acknowledged among all; for as it hath the name εὐχαριστία, so is the nature of it. It is also a consolatory Ordinance, in which we are called to spiritual joy and gladnesse, it being a feast of fat things full of marrow, and of wines on the lees well refined. At this Ordinance of the holy Supper Christ spake many a sweet and consolatory word to the disciples, and did not rebuke them nor chide them, as he had done at other times. Is it not then a healing slightly of the malady of impenitent unconverted sinners, yea a betraying of their souls to bring them to joy and comfort and thanksgivings and songs of praise, to eat of the marrow and fatnesse, and to drink of the rivers of pleasure which are in the house of God, when we ought rather call them to weeping and to mourning, to make their peace with God, and to flee from the wrath to come?

(c) Zuinglius Tom. 2. de vera & falsa Religione cap. de Sacram. *Cœna Dominica damus experimentum, quod morte Christi fidamus, quum gratulantes & læti adsimus in eo cœtu, qui Deo gratias agit pro beneficio redemptionis.*

Twelfthly, That Ordinance unto which Christ calleth none but such as have spiritual gracious qualifications, is not a converting

converting but a sealing Ordinance. But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance unto which Christ calleth none but such as have spiritual and gracious qualifications. *Ergo.*

The Proposition I hope needs no proof, because unconverted persons dead in sins and trespasses, have no spiritual gracious qualifications. The Assumption may be proved by many Scriptures. If of any Ordinance, chiefly of this; it holds true that Christ inviteth and calleth none but such as labour and are heavie loaden, *Matth.* 11. 28. such as are athirst for the water of life, *John* 7. 37. *Isa.* 55. 1. such as have the wedding garment, *Matth.* 22. 12. such as examine themselves 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. such as are Christs friends, *Cant.* 5. 1. *Eat O friends, drink yea drink abundantly O beloved.*

Thirteenthly, That Ordinance which is instituted for the Communion of Saints, is intended onely for such as are Saints, and not for unconverted sinners. But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance instituted for the Communion of Saints, and of those who are members of the same body of Christ 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. 17. compared with 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *Ergo.*

Martin Bucer de Regno Christi lib. 1. *cap.* 7. conceiveth that this Sacrament doth so far belong to the Communion of Saints, that wicked and unworthy persons are not onely to be kept back from partaking, but from the very beholding or being present in the Church at the giving of the Sacrament: which yet is more then we have affirmed.

Fourteenthly, If Baptisme it self (at least when ministred to those that are of age) is not a regenerating or converting Ordinance, far lesse is the Lords Supper a regenerating or converting Ordinance. But Baptisme it self (at least when ministred to those that are of age) is not a regenerating or converting Ordinance. *Ergo.*

The ground of the Proposition is, because Baptisme hath a nearer relation to regeneration then the Lords Supper, and therefore hath the name of the laver of regeneration. The Assumption I prove thus. 1. Because we read of no persons of age baptized by the Apostles, except such as did professe faith in Christ, gladly received the Word, and in whom some begun work of the Spirit of grace did appear (I say not that it really

was

was in all, but somewhat of it did appear in all.) 2. If the Baptisme of those who are of age be a regenerating Ordinance, then you suppose the person to be baptized an unregenerated person (even as when a Minister first preacheth the Gospel to Pagans, he cannot but suppose them to be unregenerated:) But I beleeve no consciencious Minister would adventure to baptize one who hath manifest and infallible signes of unregeneration. Sure, we cannot be answerable to God if we should minister Baptisme to a man whose works and words do manifestly declare him to be an unregenerated unconverted person. And if we may not initiate such a one, how shall we bring him to the Lords Table?

Fifteenthly, If the Baptisme even of those who are of age must necessarily precede their receiving of the Lords Supper, then the Lords Supper is not a converting but a sealing Ordinance. But the Baptisme even of those who are of age must necessarily precede their receiving of the Lords Supper. *Ergo.*

The Assumption is without controversie, it being the order observed by Christ and by the Apostles, and by all Christian Churches. The Proposition I prove thus. 1. [d] What better reason of the necessity of this precedency of Baptisme, than that Baptisme is the Sacrament of regeneration, the Lords Supper the Sacrament of our spiritual nourishment, and one must be borne before he eat and drink. 2. The Apostle saith *Gal.* 3. 27. *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* *Rom.* 6. 4. *We are buried with him by Baptisme into death.* *Col.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptisme, wherein also you are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God.* Therefore if the Sacrament of the Lords Supper be intended onely for the baptized, then it is intended onely for such as are supposed to have put on Christ, are buried and raised again with him through faith, and consequently, it is not intended for unconverted persons to convert them, but for converted persons to confirme them.

(d) Hutterus Disp. 17. de Cœna Dom. Thes. 1. *Sacramentum initiationis novi Test. puta Baptismum, ordine convenientissimo excipit Sacramentum confirmationis, quod est sacratissima Cœna Domini & Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi: tum ob causas alias, tum quod ea est fidei nostræ, in baptismo nobis collatæ, respectu nostri infirmitas, ut nisi subinde confirmetur, mox penitus fatiscat & intereat.*

Sixteenthly, The Method of the parable of the forlorne

Son maketh very much against Mr. *Prynns* opinion. The Lord is indeed ready to forgive, and hath compassion upon the poor sinner, and falls on his neck and kisseth him, and saith to his servants, *Bring forth the best robe and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet, and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it, and let us eat and be merry.* *Luke* 15. 20. 22, 23. And this is done in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, more especially and more manifestly then in any other Ordinance. But when? not while the man is yet playing the prodigal, wasting his substance with riotous living, nor yet while he is filling his belly in a far Countrey with the husks which the Swine did eat. But it was *when he came to himself*, when he *came to his Father* and said, *Father I have sinned against Heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy Son.* Then, and not till then, doth the father bestow upon him the best robe and the fatted calf. *For this my son was dead* (saith the Father) *and is alive again, was lost and is found.* Had the best robe and the fatted calf been given him before he repented and came to himself, he had (belike) been so much the more careless of comming home to his father. But we see these love tokens, this feast, and this mirth, is for entertaining a poor penitent, not for converting an impenitent sinner.

Seventeenthly, I shall draw another Argument both out of the *Directory* for the publike Worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms, and out of Mr. *Prynn* himself. Thus it is. That Ordinance from which the Minister in the Name of Christ ought *concionaliter* or Doctrinally to excommunicate all impenitent prophane persons, is not a converting but a sealing Ordinance. But the Lords Supper is an Ordinance from which the Minister ought in the Name of Christ *concionaliter* or Doctrinally to excommunicate all impenitent prophane persons, *Ergo.*

The Proposition ariseth from this ground, we ought not to dehort impenitent prophane men from converting Ordinances, but rather exhort them to come and partake thereof. The Assumption I prove, First, from the *Directory* in the head of the Lords Supper, which speaketh of the Minister thus, *Next, he is, in the Name of Christ on the one part to warn all such as are ignorant,*

ignorant, scandalous, prophane, or that live in any sin or offence against their knowledge or Conscience, that they presume not to come to that holy Table, shewing them that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgement to himself. And on the other part he is in especial manner to invite and encourage all that labour under the sence of the burthen of their sins, and fear of wrath, and desire to reach out unto a greater progresse in grace then yet they can attain unto, to come to the Lords Table. Is it not here held forth as the will of Christ, that no prophane impenitent unconverted person ought or may come to the Lords Table, but onely such as have somewhat of the work of grace in them? But let us hear Mr. *Prynn* himself. The seventh difference which he stateth between his Antagonists and himself *pag.* 28. is this. *Whether the Minister hath not fully discharged his Duty and Conscience if he give warning to unworthy Communicants of the danger they incurr by their unworthy approaches to the Lords Table, and seriously dehort them from comming to it, unlesse they repent, reform, and come prepared.*

If this be a right stating of that difference (and if it be true which Mr. *Hussey* in his Epistle to the Parliament *pag.* 7. saith, that *it is a very great and dangerous sin, if they come without repentance, faith, and charity, wherein the Minister must instruct his people publikely and privatly.*) Then I suppose that Mr. *Prynn* will not deny that a Minister ought in duty and conscience to do all this, to admonish a scandalous unworthy person, and seriously dehort &c. Onely he contends that the Minister is not bound in duty and conscience after all this to keep back such from the Sacrament. Well: I take for the present what he grants: and even by that I prove the Lords Supper is no converting Ordinance; for if it were. 1. How dare any Minister seriously dehort any unworthy person from approaching to it? May we forbid sinners to use the means of their conversion, especially if they be such as are not excommunicated nor cast out of the Church, and do desire to receive the Sacrament? (which are the cases often put by Mr. *Prynn.*) 2. How can the Minister warn such persons not to come to the Sacrament *unlesse they repent, reform, and come prepared*? If it be not a sealing Ordinance intended onely for such as do repent and re-

form, the Minister may not say so. 3. And otherwise the sence were this, that such persons ought not to come to a converting Ordinance, unlesse they be converted; for to repent, reform, and come prepared, are things which none can do who are not converted. Finally: By Mr. *Prynn* his principles, we may as well, yea rather, dehort men from comming to hear the Word unlesse they repent and reform. For *pag.* 44. he saith that the Sacrament is *as converting, yea a more humbling, regenerating, converting Ordinance then the Word.* Which if it be so, then we may more warrantably and with lesse danger to the souls of those who do not repent and reform, dehort them from comming to the Word, then from comming to the Sacrament.

Eighteenthly, That Ordinance which is not communicable to Heathens or Pagans, nor to excommunicated Christians, for their conversion from darkneſſe to light, from the power of Sathan to God, from the state of sin to the state of repentance, is not a converting Ordinance. But the Lords Supper is such. *Ergo.*

The Reason of the Proposition is, because converting Ordinances are communicable to Heathens: and thence proceeded the general Commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to teach all Nations *Matth.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15. which accordingly the Apostles did, *Rom.* 10. 18. *Col.* 1. 6. And if the Sacrament be a converting Ordinance for known impenitent scandalous prophane persons within the Church, what reason is there imaginable why it is not also a converting Ordinance for Heathens, Pagans, Turks, Jews? Or where have we the least hint in Scripture that an Ordinance which may convert the prophanest unexcommunicated person within the Church, cannot convert both Heathens and excommunicated Christians?

The Assumption I prove from Mr. *Prynns* own acknowledgement, *pag.* 38. *though the Sacrament* saith he *must not be administred to Heathens, to whom the Gospel may and must be preached, before they beleeve and professe Christ: yet it must be administred to them as well as Baptisme, after their beleef and profession of Christ.* Where he clearly grants both Sacraments, Baptisme and the Lords Supper, to be onely sealing and confirming (not convert-

converting) Ordinances to Heathens, and therefore not communicable to them, till after they beleeve and profesſe Chriſt.

Nineteenthly, That Ordinance which is not communicable nor lawful to be adminiſtred to any known impenitent ſinner under that notion, but onely as penitent ſinners, truly repenting of their ſins paſt, is not a converting but a ſealing Ordinance. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is ſuch. *Ergo.*

The Propoſition I prove thus. A converting Ordinance may be adminiſtred to known impenitent ſinners under that notion, or lookt upon as ſuch, wallowing in their blood and filthineſſe. Yea a converting Ordinance *qua* converting, is not (nor indeed can be) adminiſtred to penitent ſinners *qua* penitent, or lookt upon as truly converted. For as every effect is in order of nature poſterior to its cauſe, ſo a converting Ordinance being the inſtrumental cauſe of converſion, regeneration, and repentance, it muſt needs be ſuppoſed that converſion and repentance doth not in order of nature precede but follow after the adminiſtration of the converting Ordinance.

The Aſſumption is granted by Mr. *Prynn pag.* 37. *The Miniſter* (ſaith he) *doth not* (I ſuppoſe he will alſo ſay *ought not*) *adminiſter the Sacrament to any known impenitent ſinners under that notion, but onely as penitent ſinners, truly repenting of their ſins paſt, and promiſing, purpoſing to lead a new life for the future.* Therefore yet again by ſome of his own principles, the Sacrament is not adminiſtred as inſtrumental to the firſt converſion of ſcandalous unworthy perſons in the Church: for where there is in any Ordinance an inſtrumental cauſality toward the converſion of a ſcandalous perſon, that Ordinance muſt needs be adminiſtred to that perſon under the notion of an unconverted perſon, and the effect of converſion lookt upon as conſequent, not as antecedent.

The twentieth Argument and the laſt is this. As I have before ſhewed that Mr. *Prynn* in holding the Sacrament to be a converting Ordinance, unto which unregenerate impenitent and unbeleeving perſons (not being excommunicated) ought to be admitted, doth joyn iſſue with Papiſts, and diſſenteth from

from the Protestant writers in a very special point, and that the controversie draweth very deep: So I will now make it to appear that he dissenteth as much from the Ancients in this particular. *Dionysius Areopagita de Eccles. Hierarch. Cap. 3. Part. 3.* speaking of the nature of this Ordinance of the Lords Supper, tells us that it doth not admit those scandalous sinners who were in the condition of penitents, before they had fully manifested their repentance, much lesse prophane and unclean persons in whom no signe of repentance appeareth; τὸν μὴ παντελῶς ἱερώτατον ὄντα, *not admitting him who is not altogether most holy. Justin Martyr Apol. 2.* lets us know that in his time the Lords Supper was given to none, but to such a person as was lookt upon as a beleever, and washed in the laver of regeneration, and lived according to the rule of Christ. *Chrysostome Hom. 83. in Matth. Augustine de fide & operibus Cap. 18. Isidorus Peluſiota lib. 1. Epist. 143.* and others might be here added. But I shall bring their full testimonies chap. 17. where I will shew Antiquity to be for the suspension of scandalous persons unexcommunicated. Beside these, I add also [c] *Beda* upon 1 *Cor.* 11. who tells us both out of *Augustine* and *Prosper*, that none ought to come to the Lords Table but a justified person, and such a one as abideth in Christ and Christ in him. *Isidorus de Eccleſiaſt. offic. lib. 1. Cap. 18.* citing the Apostles words, *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily*, addeth. [f] *For this is to receive unworthily, if any man receive at that time in which he should be repenting.* The same words hath *Rabanus Maurus de Instit. Cleric. lib. 1. cap. 31.* Which plainly sheweth us that in their Judgement, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper doth suppose conversion and repentance to be already wrought, and if it be not wrought, the receiving is an unworthy receiving.

(e) *Si itaque in me manet, & ego in illo, tunc manducat, tunc bibit. Qui autem non in me manet, nec ego in illo, & si accipit Sacramentum, magnum acquirit tormentum.* Et infra. *Ad altare Dei invisibile (quo non accedit injustus) ille pervenit, qui ad hoc præsens justificatus accedit.*

(f) Hoc est enim indignè accipere, si eo tempore quis accipiat, quo debet agere pœnitentiam.

Moreover that the Lords Supper was not anciently esteemed a converting Ordinance, but a sealing Ordinance, supposing conversion, is more then apparent by the distinction of *Missa Catechu-*

Catechumenorum and *Missa fidelium*: and by that proclamation in the Church before the Sacrament, *Sancta Sanctis*, the sence whereof *Durantus de ritibus, lib. 2. cap. 55. num. 15.* giveth out of *Chrysostome* and *Cyrill*, that *Sancta Sanctis* was as much as to say: *Si quis non est sanctus, non accedat: If any man be not holy, let him not approach.* Or as if it had been said to them, The Sacrament is a holy thing, *sancti & vos cum sitis sancto Spiritu donati; and seeing you also are holy, the holy Spirit being given unto you; atque ita sancta sanctis conveniant, and so holy things agreeing to holy persons.* If the Lords Supper be a holy thing intended onely for holy persons, then (sure) it is no converting Ordinance.

I might also cite divers School-men against Mr. *Prynn* in this particular. I shall instance but in two for the present. *Scotus in lib. 4. Sent. dist. 9. Quæst. 1.* proveth from *1 Cor. 11.27.* that it is a mortal sin for a man to come to the Sacrament at that time when he is living in a mortal sin; and that he who is not spiritually a member of Christ, ought not to receive the Sacrament, which is a signe of incorporation into Christ. *Alexander Alensis part 4. Quæst. 11. Membr. 2. Art. 2. Sect. 2.* saith thus. *As there is a double bodily medicine* (curativa & conservativa) *one for cure, another for conservation, so there is a double spiritual medicine, to wit* (curativa & conservativa) *one for cure, another for conservation; repentance for the cure, the Eucharist for conservation. &c.*

CHAP. XIIII.

Mr. Prynne *his twelve Aguments brought to prove that th Lords Supper is a converting Ordinance, discussed and answered.*

IT shall be now no hard businesse to answer Mr. *Prynns* twelve Arguments, brought by him to refute my assertion, that that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is no converting Ordinance. See *Vindic. pag.* 41. to 45.

First he tells us we grant that moral carnal Christians, and all such as are not convicted of scandalous sins, are to be admitted to the Sacrament. *Threfore doubtlesse* (saith he) *it is and was intended by Christ for a converting Ordinance to all such as these, to turn them from their evil waies, and work saving grace within their hearts, since it can have no other proper primary effect in such. Certainly God and Christ bestow no Ordinances upon men in vain; therefore their intentions in instituting this Supper, even for such visible, moral, unregenerate Christian, as well as real Saints, must necessarily be for their conversion, not their confirmation and sealing onely.*

Answ. Lapsus in initio mali augurii est. He confoundeth here things most different. 1. He confoundeth our admitting of Communicants, with Gods intention to do good to their souls: and his Argument runs upon this mistake, that God intendeth good to the souls of all who come to the Lords Table, though

though wicked close Hypocrites; and since this good cannot be sealing onely, it must be conversion. But it is neither sealing, nor conversion, nor any good at all which God intends by that Ordinance to them that perish: yet it is not in vain: for he himself tells us *pag.* 34. that even in these, the Minister administring the Sacrament, is a sweet savour to God, who hath appointed the Sacrament *secundarily and contingently, to be a means of aggravating mens sins and condemnation, to magnifie his justice.* 2. There is a most dangerous mistake in that which he saith of the intentions of God and of Christ. If he mean of what God intendeth or purposeth in the Councel of his own will, that in this sence God intendeth the conversion of those that perish, is to make void and frustraneous the decree, will, and intention of God, which is grosse Arminianisme and Jesuitisme. But if he mean *finis operis*, the proper end for which the Sacrament was instituted, and the good which the Word of God tells us we ought to seek, and may through the grace of God find in the Sacrament: Then in that sence, to say that Christs intention in instituting this Sacrament was for conversion of moral unregenerate Christians, is meerly a begging of what is in question. The like I say of that proper primary effect of the Sacrament in such. If he mean the proper primary effect decreed in the secret counsel of God, he myres himself in Arminianisme. If he mean the proper primary effect of the Sacrament in respect of its own nature, this is but *petere principium.* 3. All who pretend right to the Sacrament are either visible Saints, qualified according to the rule of Christ, and such as the Eldership (examining their profession and practice according to the rules of the word) judgeth fit to be admitted to the Sacrament; or they are not such. If they be such, then the end and use of the Sacrament in reference to them, is to be a sealing Ordinance, for the Eldership judgeth and supposeth them fit to be sealed and confirmed, so far as they can understand, and in that capacity do admit them: God onely being able to judge close Hypocrites. If they be not qualified, as I have said, then we do not grant that they ought to be admitted.

His second Argument hath no strength at all. All Ordinances which strengthen grace do more or lesse begin or beget it, and

the Directory it self calls the Sacraments means of grace *pag.* 52. what then? The Directory calls this Sacrament a means of grace, because by it *Christ and all his benefits are applied and sealed up unto us*, and we *are sealed up by his Spirit to an assurance of happinesse and everlasting life.* But (saith he) why may not the Sacraments convert as well as confirm. I have given many reasons for it. If he could prove that what confirms doth also convert, why did he not do it? If he could not prove it, why brings he a strong affirmation instead of an Argument? As for that which he addeth, that the Lords Supper is received not once as Baptism, but frequently, *For this very end, that those who often fall into sin through infirmity, may likewise by this Supper often rise again, be refreshed, comforted, and get strength against their corruptions and sins: and is it not then a converting as well as a confirming Ordinance?* What a wavering is here? Is the raising, refreshing, and comforting of those who often fall through infirmity, the conversion or first grace which now we dispute of? Or whether doth he not here yeeld the cause? For the refreshing and comforting and strengthening of those that fall through infirmity, is the effect of a confirming not of a converting Ordinance. And in this sence Divines have given a reason, why we are but once baptized, but do often receive the Lords Supper, because Baptisme is the Sacrament of our initiation, the laver of regeneration; (I mean not that which hath been called *Baptismal regeneration,* fancied to be common to all the baptized, but I mean that which is wrought in and sealed to the Elect baptized) the Lords Supper is the Sacrament of our spiritual nourishment and strengthening: and it is enough to be once born, once regenerate, but we must be often nourished and strengthened.

His third Argument is this. The very receiving of the Sacrament *even in unregenerate persons*, is accompanied with such things *as are most effectual to convert.* As 1. *With a previous external serious examination of their own hearts and estates between God and their own Consciences.* 2. *A solemn searching out of all their open or secret sins and corruptions, past or present, accompanied with a serious particular private confession of them, a hearty contrition and humiliation for them &c.* 3. *Pious soul ravishing medita-*

meditations &c. which make deep temporary impressions on their hearts 4. *Flexanimous exhortations, admonitions, comminations, directions, prayers by the Ministers in the Congregation, before, in, and after this dutie.* Whereupon he leaveth it to every mans Conscience to judge whether this Sacrament is not *more likelie to regenerate and change their hearts, and lives, then the bare Word preached, or any other Ordinance.*

Answ. 1. Here is a lump of wild, uncouth, and most erroneous Divinity. Who ever heard of an external examination of mens hearts between God and their own Consciences? Or 2. That unregenerate persons can and do seriously examine their own hearts, and search out all their sins with a hearty contrition and humiliation for them? &c. Or 3. That *deep temporary impressions on their hearts* are most effectual to convert and regenerate (for he doth enumerate all these as particulars most effectual to convert.) Or 4. That in the very receiving of the Sacrament, men hear the Ministers prayers in the Congregation. 5. That this Sacrament *is more likely to regenerate then the bare Word preached* (I suppose he means not the word without the Spirit (for nobody holds the bare word in that sence to regenerate) but preaching without other concurring Ordinance) *or any other Ordinance.* Which if it be, he cannot choose but allow to give the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to excommunicated persons, and to the unbaptized, whether Heathens or Jews, being of age, and desiring to receive it.

Secondly, If all the whole Antecedent part of his Argument were granted, the consequence is naught: for this must be the consequence, If examination of mens hearts, the searching out of all their sins, confession, contrition, prayers, vowes, meditations, exhortations, which do accompany the Sacrament, be most effectual to convert and to beget grace, then the Sacrament is a converting Ordinance. Which consequence he will never prove. Put the case that self-examination, confession, prayers, vowes, meditations, exhortations; at the calling of a Parliament, at the going out of an Army, at the choosing of Magistrates or Ministers, at the death of Parents, friends, &c. prove effectual to conversion; Shall we therefore say that the calling of a Parliament, the going out of the Army, the choo-

sing of Ministers or Magistrates, the death of Parents or friends, are converting Ordinances?

His fourth Argument alone is syllogistical (I wish all his Arguments throughout his whole book had been such, that the strength or weakness thereof might the sooner appear) *That Ordinance wherein we most immediatly converse with God and Christ, and have more intimate visible sensible communion with them, then in any other, is certainly the most powerful and effectual Ordinance of all others, to humble, regenerate, convert, and beget true grace within us. &c. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper by our Antagonists own confession is such. Ergo.*

Answ. 1. I retort his Argument against himself. That Ordinance wherein we most immediatly converse with God and Christ, and have more intimate communion with them then in any other, is a sealing, confirming, but not a converting Ordinance. For they who are converting have not such intimate communion and immediat conversing with God and Christ, as they who are already converted and do walk with God as *Enoch* did, and are filled *with all joy and peace in beleeving*, *Rom.* 15. 13. even with joy unspeakable and full of glory, 1 *Pet.* 1. 8. The daughters of *Jerusalem* being sick of love for Christ, yet are far from that communion with him, which his Spouse longer acquainted with him did enjoy, therefore they ask at her, whither her beloved was gone that they might seek him with her. *Cant.* 6 1. Hath the child fed with milk more communion and conversing with his father, then the son come to years, who eateth and drinketh at his fathers Table? Do we not see often a fervent convert like *Apollos*, whom an *Aquila* and *Priscilla* must take and expound unto him the way of God more perfectly. *Act.* 18. 25, 26.

2. I deny his Proposition as he frames it, for the plain English of it is this; If it be a sealing, comforting, confirming Ordinance, then it is a converting Ordinance, which I clear thus. He takes his *Medium* from his Antagonists confession, for they accord (saith he) that we have more immediate communion with God in this Ordinance then in any other, for as much as in this Sacrament Christ is *more particularly applied, and the remission of our sins more sensibly sealed to us then in*

nay

any other Ordinance: from whence I thus infallibly conclude against these opposites. Then follows his Argument, which is no other then a putting of the converted in the condition of the unconverted, or the unconverted in the capacity of the converted: or to prove it converts, because it seals.

3. If this Sacrament be *the most powerful and effectual Ordinance of all others, to humble, regenerate, convert, and beget true grace*: it will follow that we ought (at least may) give the Sacrament not onely to the most ignorant and scandalous within the Church, but to Turks, Pagans, Jews, and to excommunicated persons, as I said before.

4. He challengeth his Antagonists for crying up and magnifying this Sacrament above the Word preached, and by way of opposition tells them that he hath in some former Tractates proved *Gods presence and Spirit to be as much, as really present in other Ordinances as in this. Vindic. pag.* 37. yet now I see no man who doth so much as himself, magnifie the Sacrament above the Word.

5. Whereas he brings this proof for his *Major* Proposition: *because the manifestation, revelation, and proximity of God and Christ to the soul, is that which doth most of all humble and convert it.* If this hold true in the generality as he propounds it, then the Spirits of just men made perfect and glorified, are converted by the revelation and proximity of God and of Christ, whereof they have unconceaveably more then the Saints on earth. But neither in this world doth the manifestation and revelation of God and of Christ, prove conversion and regeneration to be *in fieri* at that instant when God so manifesteth and revealeth himself, which is the thing he had to prove. I give instance in divers of those Scriptures cited by himself: Gods revealing of himself to *Job, chap.* 38. and 42. to *Isaiah, chap.* 6. Christs manifesting of his power to *Peter, Luke* 5. was after, not at their conversion, so that *Psal.* 148.14. But heteregeneous impertinent quotations of Scripture are usual with him: I am sorry I have cause to say it. Some other Scriptures which here he citeth may be expounded of Gods proximity to us, and ours to God in Conversion, *Isa.* 55.6. *Zeph.* 3.2. *Eph.* 2.17. *Jam.* 4.7. But that this kind of proximity which

which doth convert, is in the Sacrament, he hath supposed, but not proved.

His fifth Argument is taken from the converting power of the Word: that which makes conversion by the Word is the particular application of Christ and the promises. Now the Sacrament doth most particularly and effectually apply Christ and the promises *unto every Communicants eyes, ears, heart, and soul, far livelier then the Word preached.*

Answ. 1. This is a meer fallacy, *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter:* and easily discovered. The Sacrament applyeth Christ, but to whom? not to the unconverted and unbeleevers (for that were to give a seal without a charter) but to those that are supposed to be converted and beleevers. He had this to prove, That the Sacrament doth apply Christs death, passion, and merits to unconverted persons, and to unbeleevers, yea to their heart and soul. 2. That the Sacrament doth apply the death, passion, and merits of Christ to the Communicants *ears*, and that far livelier than the word preached, is to me a riddle which I think will trouble Mr. *Prynn* himself to expound. 3. A great controversie there hath been about the orall or corporal manducation of the body of Christ in the Sacrament. But Mr. *Prynn* out-runneth here all *Ubiquitaries* in the World, for he hath said no lesse then that every Communicant eateth spiritually and by faith the body of Christ, even unconverted persons, for he saith, that this Sacrament *doth most particularly, fully, lively, and sensibly apply the promises, yea the death, passion, and merits of Christ unto EVERY Communicants eyes, ears, HEART and SOUL.* Which is plainly universal grace to all who ever received this Sacrament (and so to *Judas*, according to his principles) and to all who ever shall receive it. 4. Whereas he would confirm this which he saith, by his Antagonists Confession; I do not think he can give any conscientious account of that word. Who said it, or where? He must needs hold universal grace, hold it who will. 5. Here lies the strength of his Argument: The Word converts by applying Christ; therefore the Sacrament, which doth more lively apply Christ to every Communicant, must be a converting Ordinance. Which necessarily implyeth, that all who receive the Sacrament

are

are converted. Yea if application inferre conversiõn, as the effect of the Application, the Saints and Beleevers themselves must be again constituted in the first Article of Conversion, and transition from the estate of nature and unregeneration. 6. The Application of Christ in the Word unto Conversion, is a thing of another nature than the Sacramental application of Christ, and therefore like effects ought not to be ascribed unto these Ordinances: For the Application of Christ made in the Word preached to the unconverted to convert them, is *per influxum Physicum*, by a most efficacious life-giving influence, as when *Elisha* applyed himself to the *Shunnamites* dead child, or like that *Ezek.* 16. 6. *John* 5. 25. and 11. 43. But this manner of influence or causality is denied to the Sacrament by many of the Schoolmen and Papists themselves. So much of his fifth Argument which I thought to answer in two words, if the many absurdities in it had given me leave.

His sixth Argument is this, All grant that God doth as effectually convert by the eye as by the ear. *All grant.* I deny it. and I verily beleeve he can produce very few Authors (if any) for it. He ought not to speak so great words without good warrants, which here I am sure he hath not. Well: but he will prove the thing it self. First he tells us of the book of Nature, and of the Creatures, by which we are instructed &c. But either he means that the very book of Nature can and doth effectually and savingly convert to Faith in Christ and to true sanctification, or not. If the affirmative, then the Heathens who lived and died in Paganisme had sufficient means and helps to conversion and faith in Christ: (for those Pagans had the book of the Creatures to instruct them, as is expressed in some Scriptures cited by himself) and so there may be salvation and the means thereof without the Church. If this be not his meaning, but that the book of Nature instructeth us concerning many things of God, yet doth not teach us to know Christ and all things necessary to salvation, far lesse doth effectually and savingly convert: then he hath said nothing to that point which he had to prove. 2. He saith that all the Sacrifices of the old Law, and Circumcision, and the Passeover did teach Gods people who participated of them, or were present at them, by the eye, and

were converting Ordinances, *as all do and must acknowledge.*

Answ. Here is another tinckling Cymbal. Do all acknowledge that the Sacraments of the Old Testament were converting Ordinances? There can be no rational account given hereof. Certainly our Writers before cited, and diverse others who denie the Sacraments of the New-Testament to be converting Ordinances, never meant to admit that the Sacraments of the old Testament were converting Ordinances. 2. How Circumcision did teach by the eye those who did participate of that Ordinance, and so Infants, is another riddle. 3. If Sacrifices under the Law had been converting Ordinances, yet that cannot be a just parallel to Sacraments, except seeking to make the Lords Supper a converting Ordinance we convert it self into a Sacrifice for sin, as Papists do. But neither doth he offer the least colour of reason to prove that all the external Sacrifices of the old Law were converting Ordinances, which here he affirmeth. The Apostle speaketh otherwise of the Legal Sacrifices, which he saith *could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience*: *Heb.* 9. 9. and therefore calls all those rites *carnal Ordinances, vers.* 10. for though they were spiritual in respect of their signification and typifying of Christ, and sealing the Covenant of grace to the faithful in the Old Testament, yet they were not spiritual in regard of their giving of grace or working conversion or purging the Conscience, for they had no such operation nor effect.

Fourthly, Mr. *Prynn* confirms his present Argument by the miracles of the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, *which* (saith he) *converted thousands without preaching, did convert and regenerate men by the eye without the ear.* For proof whereof he cites abundance of Texts of Scripture which do not prove what he saith, nay some of them prove the contrary.

Some of the Scriptures cited, do not prove conversion and regeneration by miracles, but either confirmation as *John* 2. 11. after the miracle, it is added, *and his Disciples beleeved on him.* Or some preparatory initial work before regeneration, as that *John* 3. 2. Mr. *Prynn* will hardly prove that *Nicodemus* was already regenerated at that instant, when he knew not what regeneration was: Or that those *John* 2. 23. who beleeved on Christ

when

when they saw his miracles at the feast, had any more then a temporary faith, it being said of them, that *Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men. Act.* 2. 12. *Luke* 5. 25. 26. tell us of some who at the sight of miracles were stricken with fear and amazement, and gave glory to God, which proves not that miracles did convert, but convince. The like I say of 1 *Kings* 18. 38. 39. Other Texts cited by him make expresse mention of the Word as a mean of the conversion which was wrought, as *John* 4. 50. *the man beleeved the Word that Jesus had spoken*, and this was before the miracle. *John* 7. 31. many beleeved, but they heard Christ preach *vers.* 14. So *John* 11. 45. those Jewes who beleeved on Christ after they had seen the miracle, did also hear that which Christ said, yea their beleeving is mentioned as an effect of their hearing, *vers.* 41. 42. So *Act.* 6. 8. *Stephen* did indeed great miracles, but the multiplying of the number of the Disciples, is referred to the Word, *vers.* 7. *Act.* 8. 6. it is expressely said, *And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. Quâ fide* hath Mr. *Prynn* cited this very Text to prove that men were converted by miracles without the Word, by the eye without the ear. Some other Scriptures by him quoted prove onely a popular confluence and the multitudes following of Christ. Having seen his miracles as *John* 6. 2. *and* 11. 47. 48. *Matth.* 15. 30. 31. For *the people were inclined to hearken to doctrine by miracles, which moveth natural men to flock together to see strange things* saith Mr. *Hussey. Plea for Christian Magistracy, pag.* 30. which he is pleased to clear by peoples flocking to a Mountebank. Other Texts which he citeth, speak of miracles, but not a syllable of conversion or regeneration wrought by miracles, as *Act.* 15. 12. *Act.* 19. 11. 12. Among the rest of the Texts he citeth *John* 6. 26. *Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.* And hence forsooth he will prove that miracles did convert and regenerate men. I had not touched these particulars, were it not that I desire Mr. *Prynn* himself in the fear of God may be convinced of his making too bold with the Scripture in citing and applying it very far amisse: and that for the future his Reader may be wary, and not take from him upon

trust a heap of Scriptural quotations, such as often he bringeth.

In the fourth place, he tells us, That *the things We see with our eyes do more affect, and beget deeper impressions in our hearts, then the things we hear.* He means (I think) do more effectually convert, for so he makes the Application, that *the very beholding of Christs Person, passion, without the Word, were the most effectual means of Working contrition, conversion, &c.* Well: What is his proof? He citeth Christs words to his Disciples, *Blessed are your eyes for they see*: (without adding the rest, *and your ears, for they hear*) and *Simeons* words, *Mine eyes have seen thy salvation*, as if forsooth either *Simeon* or the Apostles had been converted and regenerated by the seeing of Christs person. He cites also *Luk.* 23.46,47,48. as if all who (beholding Christs passion and death) smote upon their breasts, had been by that sight converted and regenerated. That the things we behold with our eyes, if they be great or strange things work deep impressions, there can be no doubt of it. But that the hearing of great things may not work as deep impressions, or that seeing without hearing doth convert and regenerate, hath been strongly affirmed by Mr. *Prynn*, but not yet proved.

I proceed to his seventh Argument which is this. The most melting soul-changing meditation is the serious contemplation of Christs death and Passion. No meditation comparable to this, to *regenerate and convert a carnal heart.* And is not this *effectually represented to our eyes, hearts, in this very Sacrament in a more powerful prevailing manner then in the Word alone.*

Answ. That which he had to subsume and prove is, that this Sacrament worketh in a unregenerate carnal heart such soul changing meditations of the death and passion of Christ, as it never had before (the soul having never before been regenerate) Which being the point to be proved, why did he not prove it, if he could? No doubt the Sacrament is a most powerful mean to beget in the hearts of beleevers and regenerate persons most humbling and melting meditations concerning the death of Christ. But that it begetteth any soul changing or regenerating meditations in those in whom the Word hath never yet begun the work of regeneration and conversion; I do as much disagree in this, as I agree in the other.

The

The eighth Argument which he brings is from comparing the Sacrament with afflictions. *Our own corporal external afflictions are many times without the Word the means of our repentance and converſion unto God, &c. Then much more the Sacrament, wherein the afflictions of Chriſt himſelf are ſo viſibly ſet forth before our eyes.*

Anſw. 1. It is a very bad conſequence, for the ſtrength reſolves into this principle, an unregenerate carnal man will be more affected and moved with the repreſentation of Chriſts afflictions, than with the feeling of his own corporal afflictions. 2. Affliction doth not convert without the Word either going before or accompanying it (unleſſe we ſay that Pagans or Turks may be converted ſavingly by affliction before ever they hear the Word.) *Pſal.* 94. 12. *Bleſſed is the man whom thou chaſteneſt and teacheſt him out of thy Law. Job.* 36. 9. 10. 11. *And if they be bound in fetters, and holden in cords of affliction. Then he ſheweth them their work and their tranſgreſſion that they have exceeded. He openeth alſo their ear to Diſcipline, and commandeth that they return from iniquity.* Behold converſion by afflictions, but not without the Word. While Mr. *Prynn* goeth about to prove that afflictions convert without the Word, the firſt Text he citeth is *Pſal.* 119. 67. 71. where expreſſe mention is made of the Word.

3 As for *Manaſſeh* his converſion 2 *Chron.* 33. 11. 12. it was wrought by the means of affliction, ſetting home upon his Conſcience that Word of God mentioned in the verſe imediatly preceding, which ſaith *and the Lord ſpake to Manaſſeh and to his people, but they would not hearken.* Let him ſhew the like inſtance of the converſion by the Sacrament of ſuch as would not hearken to the Word, and I ſhall yeeld the cauſe. The Word is expreſſe, that affliction is one ſpecial powerful mean of converſion, but it no where ſaith any ſuch thing of the Sacrament. 4. It was alſo incumbent to him to prove that afflictions do convert without the Word, not onely at ſuch times and in ſuch places as do ſequeſter a perſon from the liberty of hearing the Word preached, but alſo when and where the Word is freely enjoyed. Otherwiſe how far is he from concluding by Analogy the point he had to prove? which is, that an unregenerate perſon living

under the Ministery of the Gospel, and being an ordinary hearer, never converted by the Word, may nevertheless (according to the dispensation of the grace of God revealed in Scripture) be converted by the Sacrament received?

His ninth Argument is this. *That Ordinance whose unworthy participation is a means of our spiritual obduration, must by the rule of contraries when worthily received, be the instrument of our mortification, conversion, salvation. But the unworthy receiving of the Sacrament is a means &c.*

Answ. 1. This Argument doth necessarily suppose, that an unconverted, unmortified, unworthy person, while such, may yet worthily receive (and so by that means be converted) the contrary whereof I have demonstrated in my tenth Argument. 2. If the Sacrament be not worthily received, without repentance, faith, and self-examination (for which cause men are dehorted to come, except they repent &c.) then there is perfect non-sence in the Argument, for to say that the Sacrament when worthily received is the instrument of conversion, is as much as this; The Sacrament is an instrument of conversion to those who are already converted. 3. That rule of Contraries is extremely mis-applyed. The rule is *Oppositorum, quatenus talia, opposita sunt attributa, Contraries have contrary attributes.* (g) The comparison must be made *secundum differentias quibus dissident*, Otherwise that old fallacy were a good Argument. A single life is good, therefore Marriage is evil; Virginity is pure, therefore Marriage is impure: Whereas Marriage and single life are not opposed in the point of good and evil, purity and impurity, but in the point of immunity from worldly cares and troubles. So it is a bad consequence (at least against us) unworthy receiving of the Sacrament is an instrument of obduration, *Ergo* Worthy receiving of it is a mean of conversion. For we hold that worthy receiving and unworthy receiving are not opposed in point of conversion, but in point of sealing: the worthy receiving seals remission and salvation: the unworthy receiving seals judgement. But Mr. *Prynn* still takes for granted what he had to prove; *viz.* That this particular is one of those *differentiæ quibus dissident ista Opposita.*

(g) Vide Kekerm. System. log. lib. 3. cap. 20.

Come on to his tenth Argument. Its taken from the ends

for

for which this Sacrament was ordained. 1. The keeping in memory Christs death. 2. *The ratification and sealing of all the promises and Covenant of grace unto the receivers souls.* 3. *To be a pledge and symbole of that most neer and effectual communion which Christians have with Christ, and that spiritual union which they enjoy with him.* 4. *To feed the communicants souls in assured hope of eternal life.* 5. To be a pledge of their resurrection. 6. *To seal unto them the assurance of everlasting life.* 7. To binde them as it were by an oath of fidelity to Christ, Whereupon he asketh how it is possible that this Sacrament *should not both in Gods intention and Christs ordination, be a converting as well as a sealing Ordinance, since that which doth seal all these particulars to mens souls,* &c. *must needs more powerfully perswade, pierce, melt, relent, convert an obdurate heart and unregenerate sinner then the Word it self?*

Answ. 1. His Argument may be strongly retorted against himself, divers of these ends of the Sacrament being such as are incompetent and unapplicable to obdurate and unregenerate sinners: How did he imagine that even to such as these, the Sacrament doth ratifie and seal to their souls all the promises and Covenant of grace, they not having yet closed with Christ in the Covenant? Or how will he make it to appear, that this Sacrament is a pledge of a most neer union and communion with Christ, even to those who are yet far from any union with Christ? Or how shall they be fed in hope and sealed in assurance of everlasting life, who are yet under the curse of the Law and state of condemnation? Surely Master *Prynne* granting here that the Sacrament is ordained of Christ to seal, and that it *doth seal all these particulars to mens souls,* doth thereby yeeld the whole cause. For that which doth seal all these particulars to mens souls, most certainly doth not convert, but presuppose conversion. 2. If this Sacrament be by Gods intention a converting Ordinance, and Gods intention being by him distinguished from Christs ordination, whether doth it not necessarily follow both from this and from his first Argument (unto which this gives more light) that God did in the secret counsel of his Will intend and decree the Conversion of *the flintiest heart and obdurateſt spirit,* as he speaketh; and that either this effect is wrought

wrought by the Sacrament in the flintiest heart and obduratest spirit (which I believe he dare not say) or that Gods decree and intention is frustrate? 3. And if the Sacrament *must needs more powerfully perswade, pierce, melt, relent, convert an obdurate heart and unregenerate sinner then the Word it self*; how then can he either seclude Pagans, or dehort impenitent unworthy persons from the Sacrament?

His eleventh Argument is the grossest and palpablest *petitio principii* of any that ever I met with, and to be offered to none except such as cannot distinguish between that which is affirmed, and that which is proved. First he tells us what true conversion is, and then asks if any thing be so prevalent to effect this as the Sacrament. This therefore I passe.

His twelfth and last Argument is an appealing to the experience of Christians. But a part of his appeal is of no use; that is, Whether this Sacrament doth not strengthen against corruptions and tentations, which doth not touch this present Controversie. It is as little to the purpose which he saith of conversion by preparations to the Sacrament, which may be by the Word, Prayer, *&c.* But that many thousands of converted Christians will experimentally affirm, that the receiving of the Sacrament was the first effectual means of their conversion, *yea, that they had not been converted had they been debarred from it for their former scandalous sins*, I do as confidently deny it as he affirmeth it: and if any who hath been a scandalous liver, whose heart was never yet turned, humbled, broken, changed by the Word, nor by any other mean of grace, should affirm that his very receiving of the Sacrament did effectually convert him, I durst not herein give credit to him. For *to the Law and to the Testimony; If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them.* And whereas he concludes, *For shame therefore disclaim this absurd irreligious paradox, for which there is not the least shadow of Scripture or solid reason*: I shall wish him for shame to disclaim this and many such like expressions more bold and arrogant, then either prudent or conscientious. And the intelligent Reader who considereth my twenty Arguments for that which he calls so absurd, and my Answers to all his twelve Arguments, will easily judge where the shame and

irre-

irreligiousneſſe will lie. If at his door, let him look to it. *Alba liguſtra cadunt, vaccinea nigra leguntur.*§

All that he addeth pag. 45, 46, 47, being at beſt rhetorical, not rational, and a ſuperſtructure upon that foundation, that the Lords Supper is a Converting Ordinance; it needs no battering, but falls of it ſelf, the foundation being taken away. And as we ought not nor cannot without ſin ſuſpend ſcandalous ſinners from the Sacrament, if it be a Converting Ordinance (upon which ſuppoſition alſo both the Advice of the Aſſembly of Divines, and the Ordinance of Parliament concerning Suſpenſion from the Sacrament, were moſt ſinful and unlawful) So if it be not a converting but a ſealing Ordinance (which I hope is now *luce clarius*) there needs no other Argument for the ſuſpenſion of ſcandalous ſinners living in groſſe reigning ſins, but this, That the end and uſe for which this Sacrament was inſtituted, is not converſion which theſe need, but ſealing and confirmation, of which they are incapable, they being ſuch as ought to be kept back *à ſignis gratiæ divinæ*, as Divines ſpeak. For how ſhall theſe that in words profeſſe God, but in their works deny him, be ſealed with the ſeals or marked with the marks of the favour and grace of *God*? Moſt certainly this Queſtion concerning the nature, end, and uſe of the Sacrament, caſts the ballance of the whole Controverſie concerning Suſpenſion: which I have therefore been the larger upon.

And whereas Maſter *Prynne* concludeth, pag. 47, with a large citation out of *Lucas Oſiander Enchir. contra Anabapt. cap. 6. quæſt.* 3. for that he ſhall have this return. Firſt, all that *Oſiander* there ſaith, is brought to prove this point againſt the Anabaptiſts, *quod etſi unum aut alterum videamus in Eccleſia aliqua flagitioſum, propterea neque ſeceſſionem faciendam, neque à ſacris congreſſibus, aut Cœna Domini Chriſtiano abſtinendum. That although in ſome Church we ſee ſome one or other flagitious perſon, yet a Chriſtian is not therefore either to make a ſeparation, or to abſtain from the ſacred Aſſemblies or the Lords Supper.* Which is not the Queſtion now agitated between us. Secondly, after that paſſage cited againſt us, Maſter *Prynne* might have taken notice of another paſſage which maketh againſt himſelf. Where the Anabaptiſts did object to the *Lutheran* Churches, their ad-

mitting of scandalous persons to the Sacrament, *Osiander* denieth it: for (saith he) although we cannot help hypocrites their coming to the Lords Table; *nos tamen scienter neminem admittimus, nisi peccatores pœnitentes*, &c. *Yet We admit none willingly, except penitent sinners who confesse their sins and sorrow for them.* Thirdly, *Osiander, ibid. Quæst.* 2. holdeth Excommunication to be an Ordinance of God, and groundeth it upon *Matth.* 18. 15, 16, 17. Therefore Master *Prynne* must seek another Patron then *Osiander*.

And now the nature of the Ordinance being cleared, there needeth no more to confute Master *Prynne* in that which he makes the eighth thing in controversie between him and his Antagonists, namely, *Whether Ministers may not as well refuse to preach the Word to such unexcommunicated, grosse, impenitent, scandalous Christians, whom they would suspend from the Sacrament.* Certainly it is not lawful but commanded as a duty to preach both to the converted and to the unconverted, without excluding the most scandalous impenitent sinners whosoever. But the Lords Supper being (according to its institution and the minde of Jesus Christ) a sealing or confirming Ordinance onely, it cannot without a violation of the Institution be given to known impenitent scandalous persons. Other particulars in his Debate concerning this eighth point of difference, which do require any Answer, I will take occasion to speak unto them in the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

Whether the admiſsion of ſcandalous and notorious ſinners to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, be a pollution and profanation of that holy Ordinance; And in what reſpects it may be ſo called?

MAſter *Huſſey* in his *Plea*, pag. 2. doth very much miſtake his mark, when in oppoſition to what I had ſaid concerning the polluting of the Sacrament by the admiſſion of the ſcandalous, he tells me out of *Beza*, that the Sacraments remain effectual to the good, though evil men come to them: and thereupon concludeth, that the Sacrament is holy and pure to the believer, notwithſtanding the unpreparedneſſe of the wicked: Which is not the thing in queſtion: much leſſe is it the Queſtion, Whether there be any ſuch thing as a pollution of the Sacrament: for this Maſter *Coleman* hath yeelded (though before he quarrelled that phraſe of polluting the Ordinances) giving inſtance in the uſing of Cheeſe in ſtead of Bread, *Male dicis*, pag. 12. But the true ſtate of the Controverſie may be laid open in theſe few diſtinctions.

Firſt, as *Scotus in lib. 4. Sent. Diſt. 3. Quæſt. 2.* diſtinguiſheth two ſorts of things which may be called neceſſary to a Sa-

crament; *necessarium simpliciter*, and *necessarium aliqualiter*: the former he calls that without which the Sacrament is no Sacrament: the later, that without which they that give the Sacrament cannot avoid sin, or the want whereof maketh the Ministery guilty; so do I distinguish two sorts of pollution of the Sacrament, one which makes the Sacrament no Sacrament, but a common or unhallowed thing to those that do receive it, as (for instance) if the Sacrament were given by those that are no Ministers, or to those that are no Church, or without the blessing and breaking of bread: Another which makes the ministration of the Sacrament *hic & nunc*, and with such circumstances to be sinful, and those that do so administer it to be guilty: and so whatsoever is done in the ministration of the Sacrament contrary to the revealed will of God, is a pollution of that Ordinance. The present Question is of the later, not of the former.

Secondly, some wicked men by their receiving the Sacrament do onely draw judgement upon themselves, and these are close hypocrites: Others by their receiving of the Sacrament do involve not themselves onely, but others also into sin and Gods displeasure; and these are scandalous notorious sinners.

Thirdly, the sin of those who pollute the Sacrament by using it contrary to the nature and institution of it, may be the sin of others, and those others accessary to such pollution of the Sacrament two ways: either it is the sin of the whole Church, none excepted, so that none that communicateth then and there can be free of the sin, as where the bread is elevated and worshipped, all the communicants are *eo ipso* that they joyn in the Sacrament then and there, partakers of the sin of bread-worship, though perhaps some of them do not joyn in the act of worshipping the bread, but have done what they could to prevent or hinder it. Or it is the sin onely of so many as have not done what they ought and might have done for observing the Institution, rule and example of Jesus Christ. And of this sort is the sin of communicating with scandalous and profane men. If private Christians have interposed, by admonitions given to the offender, and by petitions put up to those that have authority and power for restraining the scandalous from the Lords Table, they have discharged their consciences, and may without

sin

sin communicate, though some scandalous members be admitted: for such persons sin in taking the Sacrament, but worthy communicants are not partakers of their sin. But if Church-officers who have a charge and authority from Jesus Christ, to receive none whom they know to be unworthy, profane and scandalous, shall notwithstanding admit such persons, they are thereby partakers of their sin, so that their receiving, or rather polluting of the Sacrament, is imputed not to themselves onely, but to the Church-officers who had authority to keep them back, and did it not.

Fourthly, the suffering of a mixture of known wicked persons among the godly in the Church, doth sometime defile us with sin, sometime not. It doth not defile us, when we use all lawful and possible remedies against it, and namely, when we exercise the Discipline of Excommunication, and other Church-censures, saith *Augustine*, *lib. contra Donatistas*, *post collationem*, *cap.* 4. *Tom.* 7. But it doth defile us, and we do incur sin and wrath, when the means of redressing such known evils are neglected, *indisciplinata patientia* (it is *Augustines* word) so to bear with wicked men, as not to execute discipline against them, that certainly makes us partakers of their sin. I mean in a reformed and well constituted Church, where the thing is feasible. But where it cannot be done, because of persecution, or because of the invincible opposition either of authority, or of a prevalent profane multitude, in that case we have onely this comfort left us, *Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousnesse*; and, *in magnis voluisse sat est*.

Fifthly, neither doth this Question concerning the pollution or profanation, or abuse of the Sacrament, concern those *peccata quotidianæ incursionis*, such sins of infirmity as all the godly, or at least the generality of the godly, are subject unto and guilty of, as long as they are in the world (for then the Sacrament should be polluted to all; for, *Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sins?*) but onely grosse and scandalous sins, such as make the Name of God and the profession of Religion to be evil spoken of and reproached, those roots of bitternesse which spring up, whereby many are like to be defiled; those that are guilty of such sins, and have given no evidence of

true Repentance, if they be received to the Sacrament, it is a profaning of the Ordinance.

Now that the admission of scandalous and notorious sinners to the Sacrament in a reformed and constituted Church, is a profanation or pollution of that Ordinance, may be thus proved.

First, *Paræus* upon the 82 Question in the *Heidelberg* Catechism, where it is affirmed, that by the admission of scandalous sinners to the Sacrament, the Covenant of God is profaned, giveth this reason for it, Because as they who having no Faith nor Repentance, if they take the seals of the Covenant, do thereby profane the Covenant; so they who consent to known wicked and scandalous persons their taking of the seals, or to their coming to the Sacrament, do by such consenting make themselves guilty of profaning the Covenant of God (for the doer and the consenter fall under the same breach of law) yea, so far do they sin by such consenting, as that they do thereby acknowledge the children of the devil to be the children of God, and the enemies of God to be in Covenant and to have fellowship with God. He distinguisheth these two things, who ought to come to the Sacrament, and who ought to be admitted. None ought to come, except those who truely believe and repent: None ought to be admitted, except such as are supposed to be believers and penitent, there being nothing known to the contrary. If any impenitent sinner take the Sacrament, he profanes the Covenant of God. If the Church admit to the Sacrament any known to live in wickedness without repentance, the Church profaneth the Covenant of God.

Secondly, that Ordinance which is not a converting but a sealing Ordinance, which is not appointed for the conversion of sinners but for the communion of Saints, is certainly profaned and abused contrary to the nature, institution, and proper end thereof, if those who are manifestly ungodly, profane, impenitent, and unconverted, be admitted to the participation thereof. But the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is not a converting but a sealing Ordinance, *&c.* which I have proved by infallible demonstrations. *Ergo.*

Thirdly, That use of the Sacrament which is repugnant and

and contradictory to the Word truly and faithfully preached in the name of Christ, is a prophaning of the Sacrament. But to give the Sacrament to those who are known to live in grosse sins without repentance, is an use of the Sacrament which is repugnant and contradictory to the Word truly and faithfully preached in the Name of Christ. *Ergo.*

I suppose no man will denie, that if we truly and faithfully preach the Word, we may and ought to pronounce and declare such as live in sin impenitent and unconverted, to be under Gods wrath and displeasure as long as they continue in that estate. *Be not deceived* saith the Apostle, *neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor theeves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the Kingdom of God.* 1 *Cor.* 6. 9. 10. See the like *Ephes.* 5. 5, 6, 7. Whence it is, that doctrinally we warn the ignorant and scandalous, and all such as live in known sins without repentance, that they presume not to come and prophane that holy Table. Of which Ministers are appointed by the Directory to give warning. How then can we by giving the Sacrament to such as these, give the lye to the Word? For what other thing shall we do; if those whom the Word pronounceth to have no part in the Kingdom of God nor of Christ, shall be admitted as well as the Godly to eat and drink at the Lords Table, while known to continue in the committing of their damnable sins, or while it is known that *they have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousness which they have committed?* 2 *Cor.* 12. 21. What is this but to absolve in the Sacrament those who are condemned in the Word, and to open the Kingdom of Heaven in the Sacrament unto those on whom the Word shutteth it?

(b) Zach. Ursin. Judicium de disciplina Ecclesiastica. Tom. 3. pag. 806. *Hæc enim Dei voluntas non erit in æternum, ut Ecclesia Christiana alicui gratiam Christi & remissionem peccatorum, annunciatione verbi divini deneget, & eidem exhibitione Sacramentorum spondeat.*

Fourthly, That use of the Sacrament which strengtheneth the hands of the wicked, so that he turneth not from his wickedness, is an abuse and profanation of the Sacrament. But the giving of the Sacrament to any known prophane impenitent person is such an use of the Sacrament as strengtheneth the hands of the wicked, so that he turneth not from his wickedness. *Ergo.*

I appeal to the experience of all godly and faithful ministers, whether

whether they have not found it a great deal more difficult to convince or convert such prophane men as have been usually admitted to the Sacrament, then to convince or convert such as have been kept back from the Sacrament? No marvel that such prophane ones as have usually received the seals of the Covenant of grace, and joyned in the highest act of Church-communion, live in a good opinion of their souls estate, and trust in lying words, *Have we not eaten and drunken at thy Table? The Sacrament, The Sacrament*, as of old *The Temple, The Temple.* Mr. *Prynn* thinks, that the Minister hath fully discharged his duty and conscience, if he give warning to unworthy Communicants of the danger they incurre by their unworthy approaches to the Lords Table. *Vindic. pag.* 28, 29. But he may be pleased to receive an answer from himself, *pag.* 43. *The things we see with our eyes do more affect and beget deeper impressions in our hearts, then the things we hear.* The Word preached is *Verbum audibile*, the Sacrament is *Verbum visibile.* How shall prophane ones be perswaded by their ears to beleeve that whereof they see the contrary with their eyes? they will give more credit in Mr. *Prynns* own opinion to the visible Word, then to the audible Word.

11 Fifthly, If it were a prophanation of the Sacrament of Baptisme to baptize a Catechumene, a Jew, or a Pagan professing a resolution to turn Christian, he being manifestly under the power of abominable reigning sins, and being still a prophane and wicked liver, although he were able to give a sound and Orthodox Confession of Faith: then it is also a prophanation of the Lords Supper to admit unto it abominable and prophane livers. But it were a prophanation of the Sacrament of Baptisme &c. *Augustine lib. de fide & operibus cap.* 18. tells us, that the Church did not admit whores and such other scandalous persons to Baptisme. *Et nisi egerint ab his mortuis operibus*
11 *pœnitentiam, accedere ad Baptismum non sinuntur. And except they repent* (saith he) *from these dead works, they are not suffered to come unto Baptisme.* Divers Arguments he brings in that Book for this thing, as 1. That *Peter* saith (*Act.* 2. 38.) *Repent and be baptized.* 2. That the Apostle *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. joyneth repentance from dead works with Baptisme. 3. That *John* preached

preached the Baptisme of Repentance. 4. That fornicators, adulterers, theeves, &c. shall not inherit the Kingdom of God: therefore such as are known to live in these sins without repentance ought not to be baptized. 5. He argueth from 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 15, 16. &c. Now I offer this *Quere.* Shall an abominable wicked life, murther, adultery, swearing, cursing, lying, or the like keep back a man from so much as entering into the visible Church by the door of Baptism, and shall not the like abominations keep back a man from Fellowship with the Saints at the Lords Table? Is there more evidence of Saintship required in those who come to be baptized, then in those who come to the Lords Table? If there be, let our Opposites speak it out, and open up the riddle. If there be not, then how can their Tenent avoid the prophanation of the Lords Table?

Sixthly, That Ordinance which is prophaned by admitting Infants and Idiots who can make no good use of it, is much more prophaned by admitting abominable and known prophane persons who make a very bad use of it. But the Lords Supper is prophaned by admitting Infants and Idiots who can make no good use of it. *Ergo.*

Mr. *Prynn pag.* 29. yeeldeth that children, fools, and distracted men, are by a natural disability made uncapable of receiving the Lords Supper, because unable to examine themselves, to which (saith he) notwithstanding they have been admitted in some Churches. In what Churches fools and distracted men have been admitted to the Lords Supper, I should have willingly learned from him, for as yet I know not any such thing Children I know were somtime admitted by the Ancients who did afterward discover their own great error in that particular. However, He yeelds as I take it, children and fools to be uncapable of the Lords Supper. And why? because unable to examine themselves, in regard of natural disability. But where there is no disability in the natural faculties, may not a sinful disability which a man hath drawn upon himself (as ignorance, drunkenesse, corrupt and atheistical opinions, presumptuous excusing or defending of sin) make him unable to examine himself? Shall men that are unable to examine themselves be admitted to the Sacrament, because not disabled by a-

ny natural disability? Sure this was far from *Pauls* thoughts when he delivered that rule concerning examining our selves before the Sacrament. Whoever they be who are unable to examine themselves, whether naturally or sinfully, much more they who manifestly appear unwilling to examine themselves, if they be admitted and allowed to come to the Lords Supper, it is a high and haynous prophanation of that Ordinance. Wherefore to prosecute my Argument, Why do we exclude Infants and Idiots? because the Apostle saith, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup*: but Infants and Idiots cannot examine themselves. Now a positive
11 prophanation of the Sacrament, is worse then a negative prophanation of it: *abuti* is more then *non bene uti*. We know that prophane impenitent sinners will not onely make no good use of the Sacrament, nor examine themselves aright, but will abuse it to the worst use that can be, even to flatter themselves in their wickedness, and to harden themselves in sin and impenitency. Mr. *Prynn* will tell us, we know not but God may convert such at the Sacrament. But there is not the least hint in all the Word of God of any impenitent sinner converted by the Sacrament. And beside, it is as easie for God to give an Idiot or distracted man his right wits, and to illuminate him with a self-examining knowledge and light in the very instant of approaching to or sitting down at the Table; And if *a possibility, a peradventure, it may be, and who knoweth but it may convert and do them good*, be a warrantable ground for Ministers to administer the Sacrament to prophane and scandalous persons as Mr. *Prynn* holds, *pag.* 47. why shall not the same ground be as warrantable for admitting Idiots.

Seventhly, If the Temple was polluted and prophaned by the comming of prophane and abominable persons into it, then is the Sacrament of the Lords Supper also profaned by such persons their participation of it. But the Temple was polluted and prophaned &c. The reason of the consequence in the Proposition is, because as the Temple had a Sacramental signification of Christ, and a certain Ceremonial holiness, as well as the Lords Table, so it will be *durus sermo* (and I presume none of our Opposites will adventure to say it) that such prophaness as did of old

keep

keep back men from the Temple, cannot now exclude them from the Sacrament.

The Assumption is largely proved in the first Book, both from Scripture and from Jewish writers. That one place *Ezek.* 23. 38. 39. (beside divers others) cleareth it. *Moreover this they have done unto me: they have defiled my Sanctuary in the same day, and have prophaned my Sabbaths: For when they had slain their children to their Idols, then they came the same day into my Sanctuary to prophane it.* You see the Temple was prophaned and polluted, not onely by those that were ceremonially unclean, but by Idolaters and Murtherers when any such presumed to come into the Temple.

Eightly, I desire the scope of that place *Hag.* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14. may be considered. The Lord is teaching his people, that a thing legally holy, could not by the touch thereof sanctifie that which by the Law was common and not holy, yet he which was legally unclean, did defile whatsoever he touched, yea though it were legally holy. *So is this people, and so is this Nation before me, saith the Lord, and so is every work of their hands, and that which they offer there is unclean.* The legal holinesse and uncleanesse were significant ceremonies to teach the people the necessity of moral holinesse, and the evil or danger of moral uncleanesse: Hence God himself argues from the significant ceremony to the morality, so as the place holds forth by necessary plain consequence these three propositions. 1. The ceremonial uncleanesse did signifie the moral uncleanesse, and the effect of the former did signifie the effect of the latter. 2. Unholy persons are not sanctified by their approaching to, or joyning in holy Ordinances: but he that is filthy will be filthy still, and he that is unjust, unjust still. If God do not give them his Spirit to sanctifie them, the Ordinances cannot do it. 3. Yet unholy persons, while such, do defile holy Ordinances, and that by moral as well as by ceremonial uncleanesse: therefore the people themselves, and every work of their hands being evil, the Lord for that cause reckoneth their sacrifices to be unclean. Did prophane persons defile the Sacrifices of old, and do they not defile our Sacraments? Nay, I should think this, much more then that, there being more of the communi-

on of Saints in our Sacraments, then in their Sacrifices.

The ninth Argument which alone may conclude the point, shall be taken from *Matth.* 7. 6. *Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine.* If the Sacrament be a holy thing, and if prophane scandalous impenitent sinners be dogs and swyne, then to give the Sacrament to such, is to prophane and pollute the Sacrament, and indeed no better but worse then to give pearls to swine. Mr. *Prynns* reply *vindic. pag.* 39. doth not take off this Argument. For without any proof, he restricteth to certain particulars that which the Text saith generally both of the things and of the persons. First for the things, He saith the Text is principally intended of not preaching the Gospel to such, so that we must seclude them from the Word as well as from the Sacrament. But I ask, is it meant onely of the Word? He hath not said so, nor will (I think) say so. *Erastus* himself *pag.* 207. confesseth it is meant also of the Sacraments. The Text saith not, *the holy thing*, and *the pearl*, but *holy things, pearls.* It must therefore be understood *respective.* Some are so vile, and so abominably prodigiously prophane, blasphemous, mockers, persecuters, that I ought not to preach to such, but to turn away from them to others, according to Christs direction, and the Apostles example. Others are such as I may preach unto, yet ought not to pray or give thanks with them, nor to admonish them (and much lesse give them the Sacrament) Others I may admonish and pray with them, yet ought not to give them the Sacrament. And all these by reason of that rule, *Give not that which is holy to dogs*, &c. So that we are not bound up by this Text, either to seclude men from the Word, or otherwise from no holy thing. Next, The Argument holds *à fortiori*, from the Word to the Sacrament. For saith [i] *Pareus.* If Christ said this of the Word, which is common to the converted and to the unconverted, how much more must it be said of the Sacraments, which are instituted onely for such as are converted.

(i) Explic. Catech. quæst. 84. *Si enim Christus hoc dixit de verbo audibili, quod tamen institutum est conversis, & non conversis vel convertendis: multo magis hoc dicitur de verbo visibili hoc est de Sacramentis, quæ tantum conversis sunt instituta.*

As

As for that sort of persons which the Text speaks of, Master *Prynne* (following *Erastus*, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3.) saith that these doggs and swine are onely such Infidels and Heathens, who refused to embrace the Gospel, and harbour the Preachers of it: Or persecutors of the Gospel, and of the Ministers of it: Or open Apostates from the Christian faith which they once embraced. And he citeth divers Scriptures, which he saith do expressly determine it. But he observes not that the most which those Scriptures prove, is, that such men as he speaks of are doggs and swine, which is not the Question: That which he had to prove, is, that the doggs and swine which Christ speaks of, are *onely* Infidels, or persecutors, or apostates from the Christian faith. This *ONELY* he hath boldly averred, but shall never prove it. It is one thing to prove that Infidels, persecutors and apostates are doggs and swine, another thing to prove that there are no other doggs and swine. That which the Apostle *Peter* saith, of such as having escaped the pollutions of the world, and known the way of righteousnesse, do afterward turn aside from the holy Commandment, namely, that such do with the dog return to the vomit, and with the sow that was washed to the wallowing in the mire, 2 *Pet.* 2. 18, 20, 22. doth belong to all scandalous and backsliding Christians, whether they be such in doctrine or in life onely; and is generally so applied by Divines. *Erastus* himself, pag. 207. understandeth that vomit and puddle, 2 *Pet.* 2. to be the sinful pleasures of the world, *relabuntur* (saith he, glossing upon the place) *ad voluptates moresque hujus seculi*. And *Solomon* saith the same thing generally of an ungodly wicked person, *Prov.* 26. 11. *As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly.* Nor is it to be forgotten that the Apostle using the words of *Epimenides*, calls the *Cretians* evil beasts, *Tit.* 1. 12. because they professed to know God, but in their works denied him, being impure, disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. Wherefore the precept *Matth.* 7. 6. is rightly applied by *Isidorus Pelusiota*, *lib.* 1. *Epist.* 143. to the denying of the Sacrament to all persons of an unclean conversation, as well as to Jews and Hereticks. So *Chrysostome* doth apply this Text to the excluding of known unworthy men from the Sacrament; and this he doth, *Homil.* 1. *de compunctione*

one cordis, as I remember. And *Hom.* 83 *in Matth.* he hath these words to the same purpose. *If thou hadst a clear fountain committed to thy keeping, to be kept clean by thee, wouldst thou let filthy swine come and puddle in it? how much more the fountain of the Blood of Christ?* Where by *filthy swine* he understandeth all unworthy and scandalous persons whatsoever, as is evident by that which follows, and by that also which went before, where he gives instance of the scandals in life and conversation. And upon the Text it self, *Matth.* 7. he applieth it to a suspension of all such as were not acknowledged for visible Saints, not onely from receiving but from beholding the Sacrament. Hence was that in the ancient Church, *Sancta Sanctis*; at which word all others were dismissed before the receiving of the Sacrament, who were not accounted visible Saints. Hence came the distinction of *duplex missa*, that is, *duplex dimissio. Missa catechumenorum, & missa fidelium.* When the Catechumens were dismissed, then also together with them were dismissed all scandalous persons who had scandalized the Church, except such Penitents as (having now in a great measure satisfied the Church-discipline, and manifested their repentance publikely, according to certain usual degrees of publike declaration of repentance) were permitted to behold the giving and receiving of the Sacrament, after the Catechumens were gone (which yet themselves were not admitted to partake of, till they had gone thorow all the degrees, and finished the whole course of publikely manifesting Repentance; onely in the danger of death they were permitted to receive the Sacrament, before that course was finished, if they should desire it.) Then last of all, after the Sacrament, was the *missa fidelium*, the dismission of the faithful.

Augustine, lib. de fide & operibus, cap. 6. so applieth the prohibition of giving holy things to doggs, that he thence argueth against the administration of Baptism to persons living in adultery (although such as have embraced the Orthodox Doctrine) which is also the scope of that whole Book. Now if persons of a profane Conversation, though orthodox in their Judgement and Profession, be such doggs as ought to be refused Baptism when they desire it, surely they are also such doggs as ought to be refused the Lords Supper.

More-

Moreover, the onely seeming advantage which Master *Prynne* catcheth, is from the word *doggs* (which yet is no advantage; for that is applied generally to wicked and profane persons in the Scriptures above cited, and so *Revel.* 22.15.) but he shall do well to observe the word *swine* too: for (as *Grotius* upon the place, following *Chrysostome*, doth make the distinction) the doggs are such as bark and contradict; the swine such as do not bark and contradict, but by an impure life (saith he) declare how little esteem they have of the holy things. Which difference (as he conceives) the Text it self doth hint: for it mentioneth not onely the turning again to rent, which is the dogges part, but the trampling of Pearls under feet, which is the swines part.

Finally, this Argument from *Matth.*7. hath gained so much upon (b) *Erastus* himself, *lib.*3. *cap.*3. that he restricteth himself to the admission of such onely to the Sacrament as acknowledge and confesse their fault, promise amendment, and desire to use the Sacraments rightly with the rest, so far as we are able to judge. Which concession will go far.

(8) *Pag.* 107. *Sermo noster de illis est, qui crimen agnoscunt & confitentur: qui emendationem promittunt: qui Sacramentis rectè cum cæteris uti,* quantum judicare nos possumus, *desiderant.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

An Argument of Erastus (*drawn from the Baptism of* John) *against the excluding of scandalous sinners from the Lords Supper, examined.*

THe strongest Arguments of *Erastus* drawn from the Old Testament, I have before discussed. Another Argument of his which deserveth an Answer (for I take him in his greatest strength) is this. *John Baptist* (saith he) did baptize all, none excepted, who came to him to be baptized; yea, even the Pharisees and Sadducees, whom yet he called *a generation of Vipers.*

Answer. 1. They that were baptized by *John*, did confesse their sins, and professe Repentance; and (l) *Erastus* himself brings in *John Baptist* speaking to those Pharisees on this manner. I do not see into your hearts, but he that cometh after me, hath his fan in his hand, and will separate the chaff from the wheat: so that though ye may deceive me with a feigned repentance, yet you cannot deceive him. Hereupon *Erastus* concludeth, that the Ministers of the Gospel ought not to deny the Sacraments to those that professe repentance, and ought not take upon them to judge of mens hearts whether they do truely and unfeignedly repent. (m) Now all this maketh for the suspension

(l) *Pag.* 12.

(m) Medina in tertiam partem, quæst. 38. *Verum cum non sit idem, agnoscere se peccatorem, & confiteri peccata sua, recte intelligimus eos sua peccata saltem majora indicasse, & confessos esse D.* Johanni, *sicut & Act.* 19. *multi credentium dicuntur venisse ad* Paulum *confitentes & annuntiantes actus suos.*

from

from the Sacrament of all such as do not confesse their sins, nor professe repentance for the same: The drunkard that will not confesse his drunkennesse, the unclean person that will not confesse his uncleannesse, the Sabbath-breaker that will not confesse his breach of the Sabbath, are by this ground to be excluded; and so of other scandalous persons. We are not to judge of mens hearts, but we are to judge of the external signes of repentance, whether sin be confessed, and repentance declared by some hopeful signes or not.

2. Neither doth his argument fully reach admission to the Lords Table, where some further and more exact proof must be had of ones fitnesse and qualification for the communion of Saints. Even those that are of age when they are baptized are but *Incipientes*: when they come to the Lords Table they are *proficientes*: There is some more required in proficients, then in Novices and beginners: as there is more required to fit one for strong meat then for milk.

3. It is also a question whether those Pharisees that came to the baptisme of *John* were indeed baptized of him [n] *Tostatus* tells us some think they were not baptized, and they prove it from *Luk.* 7. 29. 30. *And all the People that heard him and the Publicans justified God, being baptized with the Baptisme of John. But the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.* There is a controversie whether these be the words of our Saviour Christ, or of the Evangelist *Luke*. But there can be no controversie of this, that the Pharisees and Lawyers were not baptized of *John*, but the people and the publicans were. Which may very well be extended to those Pharisees of whom we read *Matth.* 3. 7. For the holy Ghost having said of the people, that they were baptized of *John* in *Jordan*, confessing their sins, he saith no such thing of the Pharisees, but onely that they came to his Baptisme (whether to see the fashion and the new Ceremony, or whether with an intention to be baptized) after which we read no more but that *John* gave them a most sharp admonition, and called them a generation of vipers, and told them that they should not glory in being *Abrahams* children: Whereupon it may seem they went away displeased and unbaptized. But

(n) In Matth. 3. quæst. 64. So Salmeron Tom. 4. Part. 1. Tract. 5. *Narrantur venisse ad Johannem & ad baptisinum suum. Non constat autem an baptisati fuerint: nam Luc. 7. dicuntur spreviisse consilium Dei in semet ipsos, non baptisati a Johanne.*

when I compare the Evangelists together, that which appears to me to be meant *Matth.* 3. 7. concerning many of the Pharisees comming to the Baptisme of *John*, is that they were sent from *Jerusalem* with a message to ask *John*, *Who art thou?* For they who were sent upon that message were of the Pharisees, *John* 1. 24. and they were sent to *Bethabara* beyond *Jordan* where *John* was baptizing, *John* 1. 28. and a part of *Johns* answer to them was, *I baptize with water, but there standeth one among you whom ye know not*: &c. *John* 1. 26. In both passages *John* speaks of him that was to come after him, whom he preferreth before himself. In both, he professeth that he could do no more but baptize with Water or Ministerially. In both, he saith he was not worthy to unloose the latchet of Christs shoe. So that many of the circumstances do agree with the story, *Matth.* 3. and the other circumstances are not inconsistent. In the other Evangelists it is, *I baptize you with water*: But that proves not that the Pharisees who were sent to *John*, were baptized, for *Luke* doth plainly apply those words to the people *Luke* 3. 15. 16. 18. But when the Pharisees asked *John*, *Why baptizest thou &c.* the answer to them was not *I baptize you with Water*, but *I baptize with Water.* (o) The Centurists think that the Pharisees who were sent from *Jerusalem* to *John* to ask him *Who art thou? John* 1. were not sent from any good esteem which was had of *John*, but from malice, and an intent to quarrel with him. This they prove because *John* saith to them *O Generation of Vipers*, *who hath forewarned you to flee from the wrath to come?* Which insinuateth a coincidency of these two stories related *Matth.* 3. and *John* 1. (p) *Salmeron* thinks that message was sent to *John* out of honour and respect to him, and he endeavours to confute the Centurists, but among all his answers he doth not averre (which had been his best reply, if he had thought it probable) that those words *O Generation of Vipers*, were not spoken to the Pharisees that were sent from *Jerusalem* to *John*. Yea (q) *Salmeron* himself doth in another place observe divers coincidencies between the story of that which passed between *John*, and the Pharisees that came to his baptism; and the story of that which passed between *John* and the Pharisees that were sent to him from *Jerusalem*.

(o) Cent. 1. lib. 1. cap. 10.

(p) Tom. 4. part. 1. Tract. 15.

(q) Ibid. Tract. 6.

4. *Erastus*

4. *Erastus* argueth from the admission of a generation of Vipers to Baptisme, to prove the lawfulnesse of admitting a generation of Vipers to the Lords Supper. But I argue contrariwise. Such persons as desire to be received into the Church by Baptisme, if they be prophane and scandalous persons, ought not to be baptized but refused baptisme, as *Augustine* proveth in his Book *De Fide & Operibus*. Therefore prophane and scandalous persons ought much lesse be admitted unto the Lords Supper. Of which Argument more before. I conclude with the [r] Centurists. *John did not cast pearls before swine: he did not admit rashly any that would to Baptisme, but such as confessed their sins, that is, onely such as were tryed and did repent, but the contumacious and the defenders of their impieties or crimes he did reject.*

(r) Cent. 1. Lib. 1. Cap. 10. *Neequaquam margaritas ante porcos proiecit: non quoslibet temere ad Baptismum admisit, sed confitentes peccata sua, hoc est, exploratos, & agentes poenitentiam tantum: contumaces vero, ac defensores suarum impietatum aut scelerum, reprobavit.*

CHAP. XVII.

Antiquity for the suspension of all scandalous persons from the Sacrament, even such as were admitted to other publike Ordinances.

MR. *Prynn* in his first *Quare* would have us beleeve that in the primitive times scandalous sinners were ever excommunicated and wholy cast out of the Church, and sequestred from all other Ordinances, as well as from the Sacrament; *And since* (saith he) *in the primitive times* (*as is evident by Tertullians Apologie* cap. 39. De pœnitentia lib. *and others*) *scandalous persons were ever excommunicated and wholy cast out of the Church* (extra gregem dati) *not barely sequestred from the Sacrament.* But for further clearing of the ancient discipline concerning suspension, I have thought good here to take notice of the particulars following.

First, That great Antiquary [1] *Albaspinæus*, proving that Church communion or fellowship was anciently larger than partaking of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; he proves it by this Argument, because many of those who had scandalously fallen, were admitted to communion with the Church in prayer and all other Ordinances, the Eucharist onely excepted.

(1) Observat. lib. 1. cap. 1. *Nam eorum in lapsos Judicium ad Eucharistiam referri nequit, quibus post aliquod tempus omnia cum cæteris fratribus volunt esse communia, præter Eucharistiam, cui enim cum fidelibus supplicationes facere & orare liceret, is ad omnia quæ erant in societate Christiana, una excepta Eucharistia, jus habere censebatur.*

Next

Next, It is well known to the searchers of Antiquity, that there were four degrees of publike declaration of repentance, προσκλαυσις, ἀκροασις, ὑποπτωσις, στασις: Which the Latines call *fletus, auditio, substratio, consistentia*: After all which followed ὑφαιρεσις, the participation of the Sacrament, which they were at last admitted unto, and is therefore mentioned by some as the fifth degree, though (to speak properly) it was not pœnal, nor any degree of censure as the other four were. First, The penitent was kept weeping at the Church door, beseeching those that went in to pray for him: thereafter he was admitted to hear the Word afar off among the Catechumens: In the third place there was a preparatory reconciliation or reception into the Church, with prayer and imposition of hands, which being done, the man was in some sort admitted into Christian fellowship, and acknowledged for a brother, yet after the Word and Prayer, he went forth with the Catechumens before the Sacrament. But there was a fourth degree after all this; he might stay in the Church, and see and hear in the celebration of the Sacrament, after the Catechumens and the three first sort of penitents were dismissed, yet still he was suspended from partaking of the Sacrament, for a certain time after he was brought to this fourth and last step: [t] So cautious were those Ancients in admitting of men to the Sacrament, till they perceived lasting, continuing, clear, and real evidences of true repentance. Three of the degrees above-mentioned are found in the Canons of the Councel of *Ancyra*, and of the Councel of *Nice*, namely the three last. The first which did not admit a man so much as into the Church to the hearing of the Word, as it was afterwards added, so it is not so justificable as the other three. But here is the point I desire may be well observed, that of old in the fourth and fifth

(t) Albaspinæus Observ. lib. 2. Observ. 25. *Quod si quæratur quam ob rem antiqui quartum illum gradum posuerint &c. Nulla potest congruentior commodiorque afferri ratio, quam quæ ex reverentia ac Religione petitur, qua adversus sanctam Eucharistiam ferebantur: detestabile quippe Deo & hominibus, non solum existimabant hominem, vel levissima macula inquinatum, aut maculæ nebula effusum, ad Eucharistiam accedere, sed etiam periculosum absolutos pœnitentes eam tangere & attrectare, quod non satis sancti & sanctificati censebantur, quibus tanta res committeretur.*

(u) Casaubon Exerc. 15. pag. 397. edit. Francof. 1615. *σύστασις igitur e mysteriis Gentium vox accepta, appellabatur statio inter fideles: ibi pœnitentes duos persæpe annos agebant; quod ad cætera ejusdem conditionis cum fidelibus; neque jam cum Catechumenis exibant; sola participatione mysteriorum cæteris fratribus inferiores.*

fifth, yea in the third Century, [u] men were admitted not only to the hearing of the Word, but to prayer with the Church, who yet were not admitted to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

(x) Conc. Ancyr. Can. 16 *De his qui irrationabiliter versati sunt sive versantur. Quotquot ante vicesimum ætatis suæ annum, tale crimen commiserint, quindecim annis exactis in pœnitentia, communionem mereantur orationum. Deinde quinquennio in hac communione durantes, tunc demum oblationis Sacramenta contingant. Discutiatur autem vita eorum, quales tempore pœnitudinis exiterint. &c.*

[x] The Council of *Ancyra* held about the year 308. *Can.* 16. appointeth some scandalous persons to shew publike signes of repentance for 15. years, before they be admitted to fellowship with the Church in prayer: and for 5. years thereafter to be kept off from the Sacrament.

(y) Conc. Nicæn. can. 11 *Duobus autem annis iisdem sine oblatione in oratione sola participent populo.*

[y] The Council of *Nice* doth plainly intimate the same thing, That some were admitted to Prayer, but not to the Sacrament. The different steps of the reception of those that had fallen may be likewise proved from [z] the Council of *Arles*.

z Conc. Arelat. 2. Can. 11. *Si qui vero dolore victi & pondere persecutionis negare & sacrificare compulsi sunt, duobus annis inter Catechumenos: triennio inter pœnitentes habeantur a communione suspensi.* *Of these* Pœnitentes *we read also* in Codice Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ Can. 43. & Can 102. *And it is certain they were admitted to the Word, and some to Prayer, but not to the Sacrament, till the Church was abundantly satisfied with the signes and proofs of their true repentance.*

J. Mich. Dilherrus Lib. 2. Electorum Cap. 1. After the mention of those τύποι τέσσαρες ἐπτημιῶν doth observe that as Antiquity did goe too far, so the later times have fallen too short. *And this is a chief cause why Christian Religion doth bear very ill among many, because Ecclesiastical Discipline hath waxed cold* * So much by the way.

* *Et causa non est postrema cur apud multos pessime audiat Christianismus: quod disciplina Ecclesiastica refrixerit.*

This of the several degrees of Penitents. I shall yet further

further insist upon, because this alone will prove that we have Antiquity for us. [a] *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* in his Canonical Epistle concerning those who in the time of the incursion of the Barbarians, had eaten things sacrificed to Idols, and had committed other scandalous sins; doth plainly distinguish these five things thus. ἡ προσκλαυσις, *The Weeping is Without the gate of the Church, Where the sinner must stand, beseeching the faithfull that come in to pray for him.* ἡ ἀκρόασις, *The hearing is Within the Gate in the Porch, where the sinner may come no nearer then the Catechumens, and thence go out again. &c.* ἡ ὑπόπτωσις, *The substration is that standing within the Church door, he go forth with the Catechumens.* ἡ σύστασις, *The consistency is that he stand still together with the faithful, and do not go forth with the Catechumens.* τελευταῖον ἡ μέθεξις τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, *In the last place the participation of the holy Mysteries or Sacrament.* He that will read the Epistles of *Basilius magnus* to *Amphilochius* will find these five degrees more particularly distinguished, applyed to several cases, and bounded by distinct intervalls of time. It were too long to transcribe all: [b] I shall onely give you some most plain passages to prove that there was in *Basils* time a suspension from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper alone, or that a man was suspended from the Sacrament, when he was not suspended from hearing and praying among the faithful.

(a) Vide apud Theod Balsam. Can. Greg. Thaumar. Can 11. *Fletus seu luctus est extra portam oratorii: ubi peccatorem stantem oportet fideles ingredientes orare ut pro se precentur. Auditio est intra portam in porticu, ubi oportet cum qui peccavit stare, usque ad Catechumenos, & illinc egredi. Audiens enim, inquit, scripturas, & doctrinam, ejiciatur, & precatione indignus censeatur. Subjectio autem seu substratio est, ut intra Templi portam stans cum Catechumenis egrediatur. Congregatio seu consistentia est, ut cum fidelibus consistat, & cum Catechumenis non egrediatur: postremo est participatio Sacramentorum.*

(b) Vide apud Theod. Balsam. Canonic. Epist. Basilii ad Amphil. Can. 4. *Oportet autem non eos (Trigamos) omnino arcere ab Ecclesia, sed dignari auditione duobus vel tribus annis: & postea permitti quidem consistere, seu in fidelium esse Congregatione, a boni tamen communione abstinere, & sic postquam pœnitentiæ fructum ullum ostenderint, communionis loco restituere.* Ibid. Can. 61. ἐνταυτὴν κωλυθήσεται μόνης τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, *anno a sola Sacramentorum communione arcebitur.* Ibid. Can. 82. *Qui autem sine necessitate suam fidem prodiderunt. cum duobus annis defleverint, & duobus annis audiverint, & in quinto in substratione fuerint, & in duobus aliis ἄνευ προσφορᾶς εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς προσευχῆς συναχθέντες sine oblatione in orationis communionem susceptι exiterint, ita tandem condigna scilicet pœnitentia ostensa, in corporis Christi communionem recipientur.* The like see Can. 56. Can. 64. Can. 66. Can. 80.

For further confirmation of the same thing, read *Conc. Ancyr. Can.* 4. *Can.* 5. *Can.* 6. *Can.* 7. *Can.* 8. *Can.* 9. *Conc. Nican. Can.* 11. *Can.* 12. *Can.* 13. *Can.* 14. I do not mean to approve

approve the too great severity of this ancient Discipline, nor do I hold it agreeable to the Will of Christ, that such as give good signes of true Repentance, and do humbly confesse and really forsake their sin, having also made publike declaration of their Repentance to the Church for removing the publike scandal, ought notwithstanding of all this, to be suspended from the Sacrament when they desire to receive it. For the Word doth not warrant the suspending of scandalous sinners from the Sacrament, until such a set determinate time be expired, but onely till they give sufficient evidence of Repentance. But setting aside this and such like circumstances, the thing it self, the suspending of a scandalous person from the Sacrament, who is not nor ought not to be suspended from assembling, hearing, and praying with the Church, is the Will of Christ, as I have proved, and was the commendable practice of the Ancient Church, which is the point I now prove against Mr. *Paynne*.

The Councel of *Ancyra Can.* 5. 16. doth also appoint the time of suspension from the Sacrament to be made shorter or longer, according as the signes of true Repentance should sooner or later, more or lesse appear in the offender. So doth the Councel of *Nice Can.* 12. And the Councel of *Carthage* held under *Honorius* and *Theodosius* the lesser. *Can.* 46.

If any man shall object against me and say; Peradventure the Penitents before spoken of, were onely such as did manifest their repentance after excommunication, and these several degrees afore-mentioned, were but the degrees of their reception or admission into the Church, so that all this shall not prove the suspension from the Sacrament of persons not excommunicated. I answer, he that will think so, will be found in a great mistake: and my Argument from Antiquity will yet stand good, for suspending from the Sacrament persons not excommunicated. For first, neither do the Canons of the Councels of *Ancyra*, and *Nice*, nor of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus* and *Basilius magnus*; nor yet the Commentators *Zonaras* and *Balsamon*, apply these five degrees above mentioned to persons who had been excommunicated, but they speak generally of persons who had committed scandalous sins, and afterward were converted and appeared penitent: for instance, those who did backslide and fall

fall in time of persecution, as multitudes did under *Licinius* and other persecuters, when they converted and professed repentance, they were received again into the Church by certain steps and degrees, some more, some fewer, according to the quality of their offence; No man that hath searched antiquity will say that all who did fall in time of persecution were excommunicated for that offence, nor yet that they were all put to the προσκλαυσις, to the weeping at the Church door, but yet all of them, even those whose offence was least (as the *Libellatici* who had taken Writs of protection from the Enemy or Persecuter) were put to the ὑποπτωσις or *consistentia*, which was a suspension or abstention from the Sacrament, even when the person was admitted to hear and pray with the Church. Wherefore the degrees afore-mentioned were degrees of receiving into the Communion of the Church scandalous persons professing repentance.

Secondly, The 61. Canon of *Basil* to *Amphilochius* speaketh thus. *He that hath stolen, if repenting of his own accord he accuse himself, shall be for a year restrained from the Communion of the holy Mysteries onely. But if he be convict, the space of two yeers shall be divided to him unto subsistration and consistency: then let him be thought worthy of the Communion.* Will any man imagine that a penitent theef accusing himself, was excommunicated? It is more then manifest that here was a suspension of an offender not excommunicated. For assoon as the offence was known by the offenders accusing of himself, he was suspended from the Sacrament alone for a year, and then admitted to the Sacrament. Yea he that was convict of theft, was not by this Canon excommunicated, nor yet put either to the προσκλαυσις, or to the ὑποπτωσις, but onely to the third and fourth degrees.

Thirdly, By the 13th. Canon of *Basil* to *Amphilochius*, he that had killed another though in a lawful war, was (for the greater reverence to the Sacrament) suspended for three yeers; and by the 55. Canon, he also that killed a Robber was suspended from the Sacrament. I do not justifie these Canons, but only I cite them to prove, that by the Ancient Discipline Persons not excommunicated were suspended from the Sacrament: for no man can imagine that a Souldier shedding blood in a lawful

war, or a man killing a Robber on the high way was therefor excommunicated.

Fourthly, The eighth general Councel called *Synodus prima & secunda*, held about the yeer 869. in the thirteenth Canon, speaking of certain turbulent Schismaticks (not being of the Clergie as the Canon speaketh, but Laicks or Monks) appointeth this censure, ἀφοριζέσθωσαν παντελῶς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Let them be totally or altogether separated from the Church.* Which intimateth that there was a lesser degree of being separated or suspended from communion with the Church. *Zonaras* upon that Canon doth so understand it, and distinguisheth a double ἀφορισμὸς [c] *For it is also a separation* (saith he) *to be excluded or restrained from the receiving of the Divine Mysteries onely. But there is another separation, which is to be cast out of the Church, which the Canon calleth a total separation, as being the heavier or greater Censure.* Which is the very same distinction with that which was afterward expressed under the terms of *major & minor*, the greater and lesser excommunication. For which also I shall give you another proof as clear and older too, taken from the 61. Canon of the sixth general Councel, where it is decreed that those who resort to Magicians, Charmers, Fortune-tellers, and such others who professe curious and unlawful arts, shall fall under the Canon of six years separation. *But as for those who persist in such things, and do not turn away nor flee from these pernicious and Heathenish studies,* παντάπασιν ἀποῤῥίπτεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκέλευσαν. *We appoint them to be altogether cast out of the Church.* Mark the gradation in the Canon, and the παντάπασιν. And hear *Balsamon* his explanation upon it. *Note from this present Canon* (saith he) *that he who sinneth and converteth, obtaineth favour,* καὶ μετρίως κολάζεται, *and is punished in a lesser measure; But he who persevereth in the evil, and is not willingly reduced to that which is better,* μεγάλως κολάζεται, *is greatly punished. For here also he that commeth and confesseth the sin, is to be punished with six yeers segregation: but he that persevereth in the evil* ἐκκήρυκτος τῆς ἐκκλησίας γενήσεται, *is to be cast out or expelled from the Church:* adde what he had said before, καὶ ἐκτὸς μετὰ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων συναυλιζήσεται, *and shall not thenceforth converse with the Orthodox.* Which intimateth as plainly as any thing can be, that there was an ἀφορισμὸς a segregation

(c) ἔστι γὰρ ἀφορισμὸς, καὶ τὸ μόνης εἴργεσθαι τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν θείων μυστηρίων, ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἶναι, ὃν παντελῶς ὠνόμασαν ὡς βαρύτερον.

gation or sequestration used in the ancient Church, which was a lesser censure than casting out of the Church and from the company of Church-members. *Zonaras* seemeth to understand the Canon otherwise, (for he saith nothing of the offenders converting and confessing his sin before the six years segregation; but that for the offence it self (committed, not confessed) a man was segregated six years, and afterward if he did not repent but continue in the offence, that then he was to be cut off, and cast out of the Church: wherein as I take it, he did explain the mind of the Councel, better then *Balsamon*. However in that point which I now prove, they are most harmonious, namely concerning a greater and lesser excommunication. *Wherefore also the Fathers of this Synod* (saith *Zonaras*) *did ordain those who do such a thing,* ὅτι ἐξαετίαν ἀφορίζεσθαι, *to be segregated for six years, &c.* ἐπιμένοντας δὲ τούτοις, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκκόπτεσθαι, *but if they continue therein, to be also cut off from the Church.*

Fifthly, To suppose that there were no *Pœnitentes* in the Ancient Church but such as were *Excommunicati*, were a greater error then that it should need any Confutation. Yea there were some pœnitents who did of their own accord confesse their offences which could not have been otherwise known but by such voluntary confession: and those saith *Zonaras Annot. in Conc. Carth. Can.* 46. were most properly called Pœnitents, I hope no man will imagine that such were excommunicated. But so it was that all the Pœnitents (even such as had neither been excommunicated nor yet forensically convict by proof of scandal, but did voluntarily confesse and convert) were for some season kept back from the Sacrament, as is manifest by that instance given out of *Basilius magnus*, of theft voluntarily confessed, for which notwithstanding the offender was for a year suspended from the Sacrament.

Sixthly, It is manifest that there were several degrees of censure upon Bishops and Presbyters. They were sometime suspended from giving the Sacrament, and as it were sequestred from the exercise of their Ministery, which suspension or sequestration is sometimes called ἀφορίζεσθαι, to be separate, sometimes ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι, to be sequestred from communion, to wit in the exercise of the Ministery, or μὴ λειτουργεῖν, not to minister

ster: There was a higher censure then this, which was depositi-on or degradation, called ἀφαίρεσιν τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ἱερατείου, the honour or degree of Presbytership to be taken away; *Basils* phrase is τῶν βαθμῶν καθαιρεῖσθαι, they are deposed from their degree. These two censures, a suspension or sequestration from the Ministery, and a total deposition from the Ministery are distinguished by the eighteenth Canon of the Councel of *Ancyra*, and the sixteenth Canon of the Councel of *Nice*, compared with the fifteenth Canon of those called the Apostles, (which certainly were not the Apostles, yet are ancient) See also *Zonaras in Can. 11. Apost.* Likewise both him and *Balsamon in Conc. Nic. Can. 16.* Again there was somthing beyond all this, which was excommunication or to be wholy cast out of the Church, a censure sometime not inflicted when the former were: For a Minister might be suspended, yea deposed from his Ministery, yet permitted to communicate or receive the Sacrament among the people, as is plainly determined *Can. 15. Apost.* and *Can. 32. Basilii ad Amphil.* If there were such degrees of censure appointed for Bishops and Presbyters, how shall we suppose that there was no lesse censure for Church-members then excommunication? For καθαίρεσις to a Minister, and ἀφορισμὸς to one of the people, were paralel. Whence it is that you will often find in the ancient Canons, and namely of the sixth general Councel, He that committeth such a fault, if he be one of the laity, let him be segregated, if one of the Clergie, let him be deposed. As therefore a further censure after καθαίρεσις might fall upon a minister; so a further censure after that ἀφορισμὸς might be inflicted upon one of the people.

I have now made it to appear that the Practice, Discipline, and Canons of the ancient Church, are for us in this present controversie about suspension from the Sacrament. In the next place I will produce particular Testimonies of Fathers. I shall take them as they fall to my hand without any curious order. I begin with *Isidorus Peluſiota* who flourished about the year 431. or (as others say) 440. In the first Book of his Epistles, *Epist.* 143, to *Thalelæus* he disswadeth from giving the Sacrament to three sort of persons. 1. To Jews. 2. To Hereticks, of both which he saith that they had once received the doctrine of truth,

but

but did after return with the dog to the vomit. 3. To persons of a prophane and swinish conversation. [d] Unto all or any of these he holds it unlawful to give the Sacrament, and that because of a divine prohibition, *Give not holy things to dogs, neither cast ye pearls before swine.* And he concludeth thus, ἡ γὰρ θεὸς τὰς τοιάτας ἧς μυσηρίων μεταδόσεις ῥίζις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος τοῖς καταφρονητικῶς μεταδιδοῦσιν. *For* saith he *the giving of the mysteries to such persons, is unto those who contemptuously give them, a breach out of which they are not awaked.*

(d) *Margaritas item ne ante porcos projiciamus, divino interdicto prohibemur, hoc est ante eos qui in vitiosis affectibus volutantur, ac porcinum vitæ genus sequuntur: ne forte inferentes: & conculcent eas pedibus, nimirum in sceleratis suis studiis divino nomini contumeliam conversi disrumpant vos.*

Dionysius Areopagita (whom I do not take to be that Areopagite converted by *Paul. Act.* 17. But certainly he is an Ancient Writer as is manifest by the *Scholia* upon him, written by *Maximus* who flourished about the year 657. He is also cited by the sixth general Councel, and by some ancient writers) *de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia cap. 3. part. 3. Sect. 6. 7.* having spoken of the exclusion of the Catechumens, Energumens, and Penitents from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, though all these heard the word read and preached, he addeth that unclean, carnal, prophane persons in whom Sathan reigneth by sin, are worse, and ought much lesse to be admitted to the Sacrament, then those who were bodily possessed of the divel. *These therefore* (unclean and profane persons) *as the first, and much rather then those* (Energumens) *let them be suspended or sequestrate by the judicial or discriminating voice of the Minister: for it is not permitted unto them to partake of any other holy thing, but the Ministery of the Word, by which they may be converted. For if this heavenly celebration of the divine Mysteries, refuse or repel, even penitents themselves (although they were sometime partakers thereof)* τὴν μὴ παντελῶς ἱερώτατον ἐπισυνημένην, *not admitting him who is not altogether most holy, &c. (for that most pure voice doth also restrain those who cannot be joyned and knit together with such as do worthily communicate in those divine mysteries) surely the multitude of those in whom vile lusts and passions do reigne, is much more prophane, and hath much lesse to do with the sight and communion of*

these holy things. The old Scholiast *Maximus* upon that place saith thus, *Note that he reckoneth together with the Energumens those that continue without repentance in the allurements of bodily pleasures, as fornicators, lovers and frequenters of unlawful plaies, such as the divine Apostle having mentioned, doth subjoyn with such a one no not to eat.* Where Mr. *Prynn* may also note by the way how anciently 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. was applied, so as might furnish an argument against the admission of scandalous persons to the Sacrament. Let us also hear the Paraphrast *Pachimeres* upon the place. *For if the celebration of the divine mysteries refuse even those who are in the very course of repentance, not admitting such, because they are not throughly or wholy purified and sanctified, as it were proclaiming it self invisible and incommunicable unto all who are not worthy to communicate,* πολλῷ γε μᾶλλον ἀπειρχθήσονται τούτοις ὁι ἔτι ἀμεταμέλητοι, *much more they who are yet impenitent are to be restrained from it.*

If you please to search further, take but one passage of [e] *Cyprian*, which speaks plainly to me for suspension from the Sacrament, for he sharply reproves the receiving to the Sacrament such persons as were not excommunicate (for if they had, most certainly he had mentioned that as the most aggravating circumstance) but having committed smaller offences, had not made out the course of publike manifesting their repentance according to the discipline of the Church.

(e) Cypr. lib. 3. Ep. 14. *Nam cum in minoribus peccatis agant peccatores pœnitentiam justo tempore, & secundum disciplinæ ordinem ad exomologesin veniant, & per manus impositionem Episcopi & Cleri jus communionis accipiant; Nunc crudo tempore, persecutione adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta Ecclesiæ ipsius pace, ad communionem admittuntur, & offertur nomen eorum, & nondum pœnitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab Episcopo & Clero imposita, Eucharistia illis datur, cum scriptum sit, Qui ederit Panem aut biberit Calicem Domini indigne, reus erit Corporis & sanguinis Domini.*

If we shall require more, we have a most plain Testimony of *Justine Martyr*, telling us that at that time they admitted none to the Lords Supper except those onely who had these three qualifications. 1. They must receive and beleeve the Doctrine preached and professed in the Church. 2. They must be washed or baptized unto the remission of sins and regeneration. 3. They must be such as live according to the rule of Christ.

[f] His

[f] His words are these. *This food is with us called the Eucharist, which is lawful for none other to partake of, but to him that believeth those things to be true which are taught by us, and is washed in the laver for remission of sins and for Regeneration, and liveth so as Christ hath delivered or commanded.*

(f) Just. Martyr Apol. 2. καὶ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία. ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταδοῦναι ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ διδασκόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λελουμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρόν, καὶ ὅτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ χριστὸς παρέδωκεν.

[g] *Walafridus Strabo* (a diligent searcher of the Ancients which were before him, and of the old Ecclesiastical Rites) who died about the year 849. mentioneth this suspension from the Sacrament, as an Ecclesiastical censure received from the Ancient Fathers: and he gives three reasons for it, to prove that it is for the sinners own good to be thus suspended. 1. That he may not involve himself in greater guiltiness. 2. That he may not be chastened of the Lord with sickness and such other afflictions as the profanation of that Sacrament brought upon the *Corinthians*. 3. That being terrified and humbled, he may think the more earnestly of repenting and recovering himself.

(e) De rebus Eccles. cap. 17. *Unde etiam criminum fœditate capitalium, a membris Christi deviantes, ab ipsis Sacramentis Ecclesiastico suspenduntur judicio.* Et infra. *Sciendum enim a sanctis Patribus ob hoc vel maxime constitutum, ut mortaliter peccantes a Sacramentis Dominicis arceantur, ne indigne ea percipientes, vel majore reatu involvantur, ut Judas, &c. Vel ne (quod Apostolus de Corinthiis dicit) infirmitatem corporis & imbecillitatem, ipsamque mortem præsumptores incurrant. Et ut a communione suspensi, terrore ejus exclusionis, & quodam condemnationis Anathemate compellantur, studiosius pœnitentiæ medicamentum appetere, & avidius recuperandæ salutis desideriis inhiare.*

It was truly said that this discipline was received from the Ancient Fathers, which as it appeareth from what hath been already said, so the Testimony of *Chrysostome* must not be forgotten. He in his tenth Homily upon *Matthew* expounding those words *Matth. 3. 6. And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins*: noteth that the time of confession belongeth to two sorts of persons: to the prophane not yet initiated; and to the baptized: to the one that upon their repentance they might get leave to partake in the holy Mysteries: to the other that being washed in Baptism from their filthiness they might come with a clean Conscience to the Lords Table. His meaning is, That neither the unbaptized nor scandalous livers though they were baptized,

baptized, might be admitted to the Lords Table, whereupon he concludeth: *Let us therefore abstain from this lewd and dissolute life.* (h) The Latin Translation rendring the sence rather then the words, speaketh more plainly. But there is a most full and plain passage of *Chrysostome* in his 83. Homily upon *Matthew*, neer the end thereof, where he saith of the Lords Supper, *Let no cruel one, no unmerciful one, none any way impure, come unto it. I speak these things both to you that do receive, and also to you that do administer. Even to you this is necessary to be told, that with great care and heedfulnes you distribute these gifts. There doth no small punishment abide you, if you permit any whose wickedness you know, to partake of this Table: for his blood shall be required at your hands. If therefore any Captain, if the Consul, if he himself that wears the Crown come unworthily, restrain him, which to do thou hast more authority then he hath.* And after. *But if you say how shall I know this man and that man? I do not speak of those that are unknown, but of those that are known. I tel you a horrible thing, it is not so ill to have among you those that are bodily possessed of the Divel, as these sinners which I speak of, &c.* (i) *Let us therefore put back not onely such as are possessed, but ALL WITHOUT DISTINCTION WHOM WE SEE TO COME UNWORTHILY, &c. But if thou thy self darest not put him back, bring the matter to me, I will permit no such thing to be done. I will sooner give up my life, than I will give the body of the Lord unworthily; and sooner suffer my blood to be poured out, than give the Lords blood unworthily, and contrary to my duty* (παρὰ τὸ πρεπόν) *to such as are horribly scandalous.* He concludeth that this discipline is medicinal and profitable in the Church, and that the keeping back of the scandalous, is the way to make many worthy Communicants.

(h) *Tempus quidem confessionis, aque & lotis baptisinate, & illotis prophanisque incumbit: illis quidem ut post patentia criminum vulnera pœnitentia inter veniente curentur, & ad sacra Mysteria redire mereantur: his vero ut ablutis in Baptismo maculis, ad Dominicam mensam munda jam Conscientia accedant.*

(i) Μὴ τοίνυν τοὺς ἐλαυνωμεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ πάντας ἁπλῶς οὓς ἂν ἴδωμεν ἀναξίως προσιόντας.

Can any man imagine that all such unworthy persons were excommunicate and wholy cast out of the Church? Do not all *Chrysostomes* Arguments militate against the admission of any scandalous and unworthy person known to be such? saith he not, that all simply or without distinction whom they perceived to come unworthily were to be put back? If onely excommunicate persons were kept back from the Sacrament, what needed all this exhortation to those that did administer the Sacrament

crament to be so careful, cautious, and heedful, whom they would admit? And if none were to be excluded from the Sacrament but those that were branded with the publike infamy of excommunication, what needed this objection to be moved, how shall I know such?

Moreover, Both *Cyprian* and [k] *Ambrose* do most plainly and undeniably hold forth different degrees of Church censures, and [l] *Cyprian* is most full and clear concerning a suspension from the Sacrament of persons not excommunicated nor cast out of the Church. For answering a case of Conscience put to him concerning certain young women whose conversation and behaviour with men had been scandalous and vile, he resolveth that so many of them as did professe repentance, and forsake such scandalous conversing and companying together, if they were still Virgins, were to be again received to communicate with the Church (namely in the Sacrament from which they had been kept back) with premonition given to them, that if they should after relapse into the like offence, they should be cast out of the Church *graviore censura* with a heavier censure: but that if they were found to have lost their Virginity, they should make out the whole course of publike Declaration of repentance, and so not be so soon admitted to, but longer suspended from the Sacrament.

(k) Ambros. lib. 2. de offic. cap. 27. cui titulus: *De benignitate & quod excommunicatio tardius sit exerenda*; saith thus *Sic Episcopi affectus boni est ut optet sanare infirmos, serpentia auferre ulcera, ADURERE ALIQUA NON ABSCINDERE: postremo quod sanari non potest, cum dolore abscindere.* (l) Cypr. lib. 1. Epist. 11. *or according to* Pamelius *his Edition* Epist. 62. *Quod si pœnitentiam hujus illiciti concubitus sui egerint, & a se invicem recesserint, inspiciantur interim Virgines ab obstetricibus diligenter, & si Virgines inventæ fuerint, accepta communicatione ad Ecclesiam admittantur, hac tamen interminatione ut si ad eosdem masculos postmodum reversæ fuerint, aut si cum eisdem in una domo & sub eodem tecto simul habitaverint, GRAVIORE CENSURA ejiciantur, nec in Ecclesiam postmodum facile recipiantur. Si autem de eis aliqua corrupta fuerit deprehensa, AGAT POENITENTIAM PLENAM.*

Adde hereunto a passage in [m] *Augustine* plainly intimating that at that time, beside reprehension, degradation, and excommunication, there were other censures daily used in the Church according to the Apostles commandement, 1 *Thess.* 3. 14. 15.

(m) Aug. lib. contra Donatist. post collationem cap. 4. *Ita sane ut nec emendationis vigilantia quiescat, corripiendo, degradando, excommunicando, cæterisque coercitionibus licitis atque concessis, quæ salva unitatis pace in Ecclesia quotidie fiunt, secundum præceptum Apostolicum charitate servata, qui dixit, Si quis autem non obaudit verbo nostro. &c.*

He is speaking of the mixture of good and bad in the Church, and that wicked men may be in some sort suffered in the Church, provided (saith he) that the discipline of Excommunication, and the other usual censures in the Church be not neglected, but duly executed where it is possible. But what were those other censures, if not the suspension of scandalous and prophane persons (not excommunicated) from the Sacraments: I appeal for further proof hereof to one passage more of *Augustine de fide & operibus cap.* 18. [n] *Whores, Stage-players, and others whosoever they be that are Professors of publike filthinesse, except such bands* (of Wickedneſſe) *be loosed and broken, are not permitted to come unto the Sacraments of Christ: which forsooth according to their judgment* (that is such as would have prophane persons baptized as well as others) *should be all admitted, unlesse the holy Church should retain the ancient and vigorous custom, which commeth from the most clear truth, by which she hath it for certain, that they who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*

(n) *Meretrices & histriones & quilibet alii publicæ turpitudinis professores, nisi solutis aut diruptis talibus vinculis, ad Christi Sacramenta non permittuntur accedere: qui utique secundum istorum sententiam omnes admitterentur, nisi antiquum & robustum morem sanctæ Ecclesia retineret, ex illa scilicet liquidissima veritate venientem, qua certum habet, quoniam qui talia agunt, Regnum Dei non possidebunt.*

Whence it will certainly follow, that all who were excluded from the Lords Table were not excommunicated persons: For first, The Church did keep back such scandalous persons upon this ground, because those who are known to live without repentance in any of those sins, of which the Apostle saith that they who do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, are not fit to be admittrd unto the Sacrament (for this were to give the Seals of salvation to those whom the Word pronounceth to be in a state of damnation.) Secondly, *Augustine* is there confuting the opinion of some (whom he calls *Fratres qui aliter sapiunt*, Brethren who otherwise understood themselves well) whose Principles did admit to the Sacraments all uncleane and scandalous persons: which cannot be meant of excommunicated persons; For there was never any such opinion maintained in the Church, that all excommunicated persons ought

ought or may be received to the Sacrament. Laſtly, Leſt his meaning ſhould be reſtricted to the Sacrament of Baptiſme onely, (of which principally and purpoſely he treateth in that Book) he ſpeaketh in the plural of the Sacraments of Chriſt.

Obſerve alſo theſe paſſages of *Gregory* called the great, *Epiſt. Lib. 2. Cap. 65. Sicut exigente culpâ, quis à Sacramento communionis dignè ſuſpenditur, ita inſontibus nullo modo talis debet irrogari vindicta. Ibid. Cap. 66. Et ſi in veſtra cognitione cujuſquam eum facinoroſi criminis reum eſſe patuerit, tunc ex noſtra auctoritate non ſolum Dominici Corporis & Sanguinis communione privatus ſit, verumetiam in Monaſterium ubi pœnitentiam agere debeat, retrudatur.* And ſo much for Antiquity in this Queſtion.

CHAP. XVIII.

A Discovery of the instability and looseness of Mr. Prynn *his Principles, even to the contradicting of himself in twelve particulars.*

I Shall not need to insist upon his tenth point of difference *Vindic. pag.* 49. nor upon his four following Quærees and Conclusion, in all which there is no new material point, but a repetition of divers particulars spoken to and debated elsewhere. As touching that hint of a new Argument *pag.* 56. *Consider the Parable of the mariage of the Kings son, where the King sent forth his servants to invite guests to the wedding Supper, who gathered together ALL they found, both BAD and good, that the wedding might be furnished with guests. Matth.* 22. 1. to 11. I answer, 1. Some understand here by the *bad* vers. 10. those who had formerly (before they were called and brought home by the Gospel) been the worst and most vicious among the Heathens, so that the words *both bad and good* make not a distinction of two sorts of Christians or Church-members, but of two sorts of Heathens not yet called, some of them were good, some of them bad comparitively, that is, some of them much better then others, some of them much worse. So *Grotius*, and long before him *Hierome* and *Theophylact* upon the place. 2. Others (as *Bucerus*

Bucerus, *Tossanus*, *Cartwright*, [o] *Gomarus*) understand by the *bad*, close Hypocrites who appear good so far as the Ministers and Officers of the Church are able to judge of them. These by a Synecdoche of the *Genus* for the *Species* may be understood by the bad. And so the Text will not comprehend scandalous and known prophane persons. That *Synecdoche generis*, is often used in Scripture, is proved by *Sal. Glassius Philolog. sacræ lib.* 5. *Tract.* 1. *Cap.* 14.

(o) In Matth. 22. *Neque enim apertos ac palam malos, Apostoli aut ulli sancti Evangelii præcones congregare, & Ecclesiæ communioni per Sacramenta aggregare potuerunt aut congregarunt, quod tales a communione Ecclesiæ tanquam pestes illius sint arcendi, sed congregarunt opertos ac tectos, quos quia sub ovina pelle sunt lupi & sub externa fidei & vitæ Christianæ specie, internam fraudem ac impietatem tegunt (atque ita vere bonis exterius pares, imo interdum superiores apparent) idcirco ab Apostolis aliisque Evangelii præconibus dignosci non potuerunt. &c.*

3. I throw back an Argument from the same Parable against himself, for the King sheweth his servants that he will have unworthy persons kept back from the marriage feast, vers. 8. *Then saith he to his servants, the Wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Luk.* 14. 24. *For I say unto unto you, that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my Supper.* The King makes it also known that he alloweth none to come in to this Mariage Feast, except such onely as have the *Wedding garment* (or as the Syriak *Wedding garments*) upon them. All which is inconsistent with Mr. *Prynns* principles concerning the admission of known scandalous unworthy persons to the Sacrament, as to a converting Ordinance.

4. And if all must be brought in or let in to the Lords Supper, both bad and good promiscuously and without distinction, then it should follow that the Ordinances of Parliament concerning the suspension *of all sorts of scandalous persons* from the Sacrament are contrary to the Will of Christ: And that Mr. *Prynn* himself in yeelding *pag.* 50. and else-where, that scandalous impenitent obstinate persons ought to be not onely suspended but excommunicated, doth yeeld what his Argument concludes to be unlawful. And so I come to that which I have here proposed, *viz.* the instability and looseness of Mr. *Prynns* principles in this controversie.

By comparing divers passages together, I find that he doth professe and pretend to yeeld the Question, which yet he doth not yeeld really and indeed. First,

First, It is to be observed that he deserteth *Erastus* and that party in the point of Excommunication. For in the *vindication* of his four Questions *pag.* 2. he readily yeeldeth *that grosse notorious scandalous obstinate sinners, who presumptuously persevere in their iniquities, after private and publike admonitions, without remorse of Conscience or AMENDMENT, may be justly excommunicated from the Church, the society of the faithful, and all publike Ordinances, after due proof and legal conviction of their scandalous lives: and that* 1. *Cor.* 5. 13. *warrants thus much. The Antidote animadverted by P.* in the first page yeeldeth that excommunication is an Ordinance of God. And indeed 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. doth not onely warrant excommunication as lawful, but injoyn and command it as necessary; for the Apostles words are præceptive and peremptory: *Therefore put away from among your selves that wicked person.* The thing was not indifferent, but necessary and such as could not without sin be omitted. However Mr. *Prynn* his asserting from that place that it may be, is a deserting of the Erastian party.

2. In the 50. page of his *vindication* he professeth that his Antagonists do contend for that which he granteth them with advantage. They would have scandalous sinners suspended from the Sacrament. He will have them not onely suspended from the Sacrament, but excommunicated from all other publike Ordinances.

3. He confesseth *ibid.* that in some cases a person not excommunicated may be suspended from the Sacrament.

But whatever his Concessions may seem to be, they are really as good as nothing. For 1. He will have none to be suspended from the Sacrament except such as are ripe for excommunication, and against whom the sentence of excommunication is ready to be pronounced as persons incorrigible. 2. He admitteth no suspension from the Sacrament till after several solemn previous publike admonitions, reprehensions, rebukes contemned or neglected. See both these pag. 50. Whence you see that with Mr. *Prynns* consent all the votes of Parliament concerning several causes of suspension from the Lords Table, shall be of no use to Presbyteries, until after a long processe of time, and after many previous publike admonitions, So that if one in the Congregation

gregation commit a notorious inceſt or murther a day or two, or a week before the celebration of the Sacrament, and the thing be undeniably certified and proved before the Elderſhip, yet the Elderſhip cannot ſuſpend ſuch an abominable ſcandalous ſinner from the Sacrament, *hac vice*: but muſt firſt go through all thoſe preparatory ſteps which are neceſſary and requiſite before excommunication.

Well: but after all thoſe publike previous admonitions, ſhall the ſentence of excommunication follow? Nay, here alſo he will have Presbyteries to go through a very narrow lane: for in the ſame place he thus deſcribeth the perſons whom he would have to be excommunicated; They are *ſcandalous, obſtinate, peremptory, incorrigible, notorious ſinners, who deſperately and profeſſedly perſevere in their groſſe ſcandalous ſins, &c.* But I beſeech you, what if they perſevere in their groſſe ſcandalous ſins neither deſperately nor profeſſedly? Muſt they not then be excommunicate? Shall not the offender be caſt out of the Church after clear proof of the offence, and ſeveral previous publike admonitions contemned or neglected? Muſt we wait till the adulterer profeſſe that he will perſevere in his adultery; and till the blaſphemer profeſſe that he will perſevere in his blaſphemy? Nay further, What if the offender do neither profeſſedly nor actually perſevere in his groſſe ſcandalous ſin? Put caſe he that hath blaſphemed once do not blaſpheme the ſecond time: and that he who groſſely and ſcandalouſly prophaned the Lords day, did it but once, and hath not done it again ſince he was reproved. Muſt this hinder the ſentence of excommunication, when that one groſſe ſcandal is not confeſſed, nor any ſigne of repentance appearing in the offender?

Moreover whereas Mr. *Prynn* in his fourth *Quære*, and in ſeveral places of his *Vindication* ſeemeth to allow none to be admitted to the Lords Table except ſuch as profeſſe ſincere repentance for ſins paſt, and promiſe newneſſe of life for time to come. If we expound his meaning by his own expreſſions in other places, that which he granteth bordereth upon nothing: for pag. 13. ſpeaking of ſcandalous ſinners their admiſſion to the Sacrament, if they profeſſe ſincere repentance for their ſins paſt, and reformation of their lives for time to come, he addeth,

as all do at least in their general confessions before the Sacrament, if not in their private meditations, prayers, &c. and a little after he saith, that *all who come to receive, do alwaies make a general and joynt confession of their sins before God and the Congregation &c.* And then he addeth pag. 14. *Yea I dare presume, there is no receiver so desperate, that dares professe when he comes to receive, he is not heartily sorry for his sins past, but resolves to persevere impenitently in them for the future, though afterward he relapse into them, as the best Saints do to their old infirmities &c.* I know the best Saints have their sinful infirmities, but whether the BEST do relapse to their OLD infirmities may be a Question. And however he doth open a wide door for receiving to the Sacrament all scandalous sinners not excommunicated, if they do but tacitely joyn in the general Confession of sins made by the whole Church, or do not contradict those general Confessions, and professe impenitency and persevering in wickedness, though in the mean time there be manifest real symptomes of impenitency, and no confession made of that particular sin which hath given publike scandal. Wherefore I say plainly with the Professors of *Leyden, Synopf. Pur. Theol. Disp.* 48. *Thes.* 35. The administration of this censure of suspension from the Lords Table hath place in these two different cases, *either when one that is called a Brother hath given some hainous scandal of life or Doctrine, who after admonition doth indeed by Word of mouth professe repentance, but yet doth not shew the fruits meet for repentance, that so the scandal might be taken away from the Church: or when he doth not so much as in Words promise or professe repentance, &c. Martin Bucer* hath a notable speech to this purpose *de Regno Christi, lib.* 1. *Cap.* 9. *To hold it enough that one do professe by Word onely repentance of sins, and say that he is sorry for his sins, and that he will amend his life, the necessarie signes and works of Repentance not being joyned with such profession, It is the part of Antichrists priests, not of Christs.*

In the next place it is to be taken notice of, how palpably and grossely Mr. *Prynn* contradicteth himself in divers particulars: Which being observed, may peradventure make himself more attentive in writing, and others more attentive in reading such subitane lucubrations. The particulars are these which follow.

Vindic.

1.

Vindicat. pag. 17. he saith, the Confession of sin which was made at the Trespasse offerings, was *not to the Priest, Classis, or Congregation, but to God alone.*

1.

In the very same page he saith, *None were kept off from making their atonement by a trespasse offering, if they did first confesse their sins to God, though perchance his confession was not cordiall, or such as the Priests approved, but external onely in shew.* I beseech you how could it be at all judged of, whether it was external and onely in shew, if it was made to God alone? Nay, if it was made to God alone, how could it be known whether he had confessed any sin at all; and so whether he was to be admitted to the trespasse offering or not?

2.

Vindic. pag. 50. He freely granteth *That ALL scandalous, obstinate, peremptory, incorrigible, notorious sinners, who desperately and professedly persevere in their grosse scandalous sins, to the dishonour of Christian Religion, the scandal of the Congregation, the ill example and infection of others, after several solemn previous publike admonitions, reprehensions, rebukes, contemned or neglected, and full conviction of their scandal and*

2.

Vindic. pag. 57. *Certainly the speediest, BEST and ONLY WAY to suppresse ALL kind of sins, schismes, to reform and purge our Churches from ALL SCANDALOUS OFFENCES, will be for Ministers NOT to draw out the sword of Excommunication and suspension against them, which will do little good, but the sword of the Spirit, the powerfull preaching of Gods Word, and the sword of the Civil Magistrate.*

impenitency, may and OUGHT TO BE EXCOMMUNICATED, suspended, &c.

If this be the best and only way to suppresse sin, and to reform and purge the Churches, How is it that some scandalous sinners may and ought to be excommunicated?

3.

Vindic. pag. 50. *Where the fact is notorious, the proofs pregnant, the sentence of excommunication ready to be pronounced against them as persons impenitently scandalous and incorrigible, perchance the Presbyterie or Classis may order a suspension from the Sacrament, or any other Ordinances, before the sentence of excommunication solemnly denounced if they see just cause.*

3.

Yet all along he disputes against the suspending from the Sacrament of a person unexcommunicated, and not suspended from all other publike Ordinances and society of Gods people. And *pag.* 50. arguing for the right of all visible members of the visible Church to the Sacrament, he saith that *nothing but an actual excommunication can suspend them from this their right.*

4.

Vindic. pag. 17. He saith that *a particular examination of the Conscience, and Repentance for sin, is nowhere required in Scripture of such who did eat the Passeover.* And herein he distinguisheth the Trespasse-offerings, and the Passeover, that in bringing a trespasse offering men came *to sue for pardon, and make atonement*, and that therefore confession of sin was necessary. *But in the Passeover*

4.

Ibid. pag. 24. He saith that the Passeover was *the same in substance with the Eucharist under the Gospel, wherein Christ was spiritually represented and received, as well as in the Lords Supper.* But how can this be, if repentance for sin was not necessary in the Passeover, and if it was onely a commemoration of a by-past temporal mercy in sparing the first born of the Israelites?

there was no atonement &c. but ONELY a commemoration of Gods infinite mercy in passing over the Israelites first born when he slew the Egyptians.

5.

Vindic. pag. 18. He saith that immediatly before the institution of the Sacrament, Christ told his Disciples that one of them should betray him, and that *Judas* was the last man that said Is it I ? *immediately before the Institution.* And pag. 27. he saith, That the other disciples did eat the Sacrament with *Judas*, *after Christ had particularly informed them and Judas himself, that he should betray him.*

5.

Yet *pag.* 25. He reckoneth that very thing to have been after the Institution of the Sacrament : for to that Objection that *Judas* went out before Supper ended, immediately after he received the sop, whereas Christ did not institute the Sacrament till after Supper : he makes this answer, that the dipping of the sop (at which time *Judas* said *is it I ?*) was at the common Supper, which (saith he) succeded the Institution of the Sacrament, so that the Sacrament was instituted after the Paschal, not after the common Supper.

And *pag.* 19. He argues that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament upon this ground, *that all this discourse and the giving of the sop to Judas was after Supper ended*; but *Christ instituted and distributed the Sacrament (at least the bread) as he sate at meat, as they were eating*, before Supper quite ended.

6.

Vindic. pag. 42. Speaking of ungodly scandalous sinners, he plainly intimateth that the receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is *more likely to regenerate and change their hearts and lives* then the Word preached. And in that same page, he holdeth that this Sacrament is *certainly the most powerful and effectual Ordinance of all others to humble, regenerate, convert.* The like see *pag.* 44, 45. and *pag.* 52. *Yea no doubt many deboſht Persons have been really reclaimed, converted, even by their acceſſe and admiſſion to the Sacrament.*

6.

Pag. 57. He ascribeth the power of godlinesse in many English Congregations to powerful preaching, and saith, that this sword of the Spirit, the powerful preaching of Gods Word, and the sword of the Civil Magistrate, *are onely able to effect this work*, to suppresse all kind of sinnes, schismes, to reform and purge the Churches. If this be *the speediest, best, and onely way to suppresse all kind of sinnes, schismes, to reform and purge our Churches from all scandalous offences*, as he there saith, and if the Word and the Magistrate are onely able to effect this work; How is it that the Lords Supper doth change mens hearts and lives, and that more effectually then any other Ordinance?

Again *pag.* 37. he saith, he hath in other Treatises of his proved *Gods presence and Spirit to be as much, as really present in other Ordinances, as in this* of the Lords Supper. How then makes he this Sacrament to be the most powerful and effectual Ordinance of all others, to humble, regenerate, convert?

7.

Pag. 40. He makes the Sacrament to be a seal to the *fences* of unworthy persons, but not to their *soules*; In this latter sence he saith it is a seal *onely to worthy penitent beleeving receivers.*

7.

Yet *Pag.* 44, 45. the strength of his tenth Argument lies in this, that the Sacrament sealeth unto the Communicants souls, yea to the flintiest heart, and obdurateſt spirit, the promises, an union with Christ, assurance of everlasting life, and therefore in regard of the sealing of all these particulars unto mens souls, must needs convert an obdurate unregenerate sinner. Which Argument were non-sence if it did not suppose the Sacrament to seal all these particulars even to the souls of unregenerate sinners. Mark but these words of his own; *since that which doth seal all these particulars to mens souls, and represent them to their saddest thoughts, must needs more powerfully perswade, pierce, melt, relent, convert an obdurate heart, and unregenerate sinner, &c.*

8.

Vindic. Pag. 28. He admitteth that a Minister ought in duty and Conscience to give warning to unworthy persons of the danger of unworthy approaching to the Lords Table, *and seriously dehort them from*

8.

Pag. 46. He tells us of an old error in forbidding drink to those who were inflamed with burning feavers, which Physitians of late have corrected by suffering such to drink freely. He desires that this old

comming to it unlesse they repent, reform, and come prepared.

error of Philistians may not enter among Divines; for as drink doth extinguish the unnatural heat which else would kill the diseased, so *feaverish Christians burning in the flames of sins and lusts* ought to be permitted freely to come to the Lords Table, because they *need it most to quench their flames.* Do these now repent, reform, and come prepared? Yet here he makes it a sin to forbid them to come to the Lords Table. Though he applieth it against suspension: yet the ground he goeth upon makes it a soul murthering sin, so much as to dehort them from that which they need most to quench the flames of their lusts.

9.

Vindic. Pag. 37. I answer, First, That the Minister doth not administer the Sacrament to any known impenitent sinners under that notion, but onely as penitent sinners, truly repenting of their sins past. The meaning of which words cannot be that the Minister gives the Sacrament to known impenitent sinners, while known to be impenitent, and yet he gives the Sacrament to those known impenitent sinners, not as im-

9.

This as it casts down what himself hath built in point of the converting Ordinance (for if the Sacrament be not administred to any known impenitent sinners under that notion, but *onely as penitent*, then it doth not work but suppose repentance and conversion in the receivers, and so is not a converting Ordinance to any receiver:) So also it is inconsistent with what himself addeth in the very same place. *Secondly*

penitent, but as penitent: which were a mighty ſtrong Bull. But the meaning muſt needs be, that the Miniſter gives the Sacrament to ſuch as have been indeed formerly lookt upon as impenitent ſinners, and known to be ſuch, but are now when they come to the Sacrament lookt upon under the notion of penitent ſinners, and that the Miniſter gives the Sacrament to none, except onely under the notion and ſuppoſition that they are truly penitent.

ſaith Mr. *Prynn*, *He* (the Miniſter) *uſeth theſe words*, The body of Chriſt which was broken, and the blood of Chriſt ſhedd for you, &c. *not abſolutely, but conditionally onely, in caſe they receive the Sacrament worthily, and become penitent and beleeving receivers, as they all profeſſe themſelves to be, juſt ſo as they preach repentance and remiſſion to their Auditors; Therefore the caſe is juſt, the ſame in both* (the Word preached and the Sacrament) *without any difference*: Here Chriſt is offered in the Sacrament, as well as in the Word, and accordingly the Sacrament adminiſtred to known impenitent ſinners under that notion, and as ſtill known to be impenitent upon condition that they become penitent.

10.

Vindic. Pag. 52. *It being onely the total excluſion from the Church and all Chriſtian ſociety* (not any bare ſuſpenſion from the Sacrament) *which works both ſhame and remorſe in excommunicate perſons, as Paul reſolves,* 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. *compared with* 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. *to* 11.

10.

Yet *Vindic. pag.* 4. and 10. he denieth that either 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. 11. or 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 14. can amount to any Excommunication or excluſion from the Church, and expounds both theſe places of a private withdrawing of Civil Fellowſhip, without any publique judicial Act or Church cenſure.

11.

In his *Epistle to the Reader* before his *Vindication*, he disclaimeth that which some conceived to be his opinion, *viz.* that the Ministers and elders of Christs Church, *ought not to be trusted with the power of Church censures, or that all of them are to be abridged of this power*: and professeth that these debates of his tend onely to a regular orderly settlement of the power of Presbyteries, *not to take from them all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction due by divine right to them, but to confine it within certain definite limits.*

11.

Diotrephes catechised, pag. 7. It is the safest readiest way to unity and Reformation, to remit the punishment of all scandalous offences to the civil Magistrate, rather then to the pretended disputable questioned authority of Presbyteries, Classes, or Congregations.

12.

Vindic. pag. 2. He agreeth with his Opposites that scandalous obstinate sinners after proof and conviction, *may be justly excommunicated from the Church &c. And that* 1 Cor. 5. 13. *warrants thus much &c. So that thus far there is no dissent on either part.* Remember the present controversie which he speaks to, is concerning excommunication in *England*, and so under a Christian Magistracy.

12.

Diotrephes catechised, pag. 9. 10. He plainly intimateth that 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. is no satisfactory Argument *for the continuance and exercise of Excommunication* in all Churches, and where *the Magistrates be Christian.* And that those who presse this Text, may as well conclude from the very next words, 1 Cor. *6.* 1. to *9. that it is unlawful for Christians to go to Law before any Christian Judges now,* &c. Where by the way it is also to be noted, that he should have said *before any heathen judges.* Otherwise the Argument cannot be parallel.

I shall now close with four Counter-Queries to Mr. Prynne.

1. Since *diu deliberandum quod semel statuendum*, which is a received maxime, approved by prudent men, and God himself, as his Epistle to the Reader saith; whether was it well done to publish his *subitane lucubrations* (as himself in that preface calls them) and upon so short deliberation to ingage in this publike and litigious manner against the desires of the Reverend and Learned Assembly, especially in a business wherein it is well known the hearts of godly people do generally go along with them?

2. Whether Mr. *Prynns* language be not very much changed from what it was in the Prelats times: seeing *Vindic. pag.* 7. he hath these words, *our opposites generally grant, &c.* citing onely *Cartwright*? And are the old non Conformists of blessed memory, now Opposites? Where are we? I confesse as he now stands affected, he is opposite to the old non-Conformists, and they to him. For instance. Mr. *Hildersham Lect.* 5. on *Psal.* 51. holdeth that all open and scandalous sinners should do open and publike repentance, and acknowledge their scandalous sins in the Congregation, otherwise to be kept back from the holy Communion. And while Mr. *Prynn* pleadeth that *Matth.* 18. 15, 16, 17. is not meant of a Presbyterie or of any Church-censure, he manifestly dissenteth from the non-Conformist, and joyneth issue with Bpp. *Bilson de gubern. Eccl. c.* 4. and *Sutlivius de Presbyterio cap.* 9. pleading for Prelacy against Presbyterie.

3. Seeing the businesse of excommunication and sequestration from the Sacrament, now in publike agitation, is a matter of great moment, much difficulty, and very circumspectly to be handled, established, to prevent profanation and scandal on the one hand; and arbitrary, tyrannical, papal domineering power over the Consciences, the spiritual priviledges of Christians, on the other. (These are his own words in the preface of his Quæries) whether hath he gone in an even path to avoid both these evills? Or whether hath he not declined to the left hand, while he shunned the error of the right hand? Whether hath he

not so gone about to cure the heat of the liver, as to leave a cold and phlegmatick stomack uncured? And whether doth he not trespasse against that rule of his owne last cited, when he adviseth this as the best and onely way to suppresse all kind of sins, and to reform and purge the Churches of this Kingdom, that the sword of excommunication and suspension be not drawn, but onely the sword of the spirit, and the sword of the Magistrate? *Vindic. pag.* 57. Finally, Whether in this Kingdom there be more cause to fear and apprehend an arbitrary, tyrannical, papal domineering power over the Consciences of Christians, (where Church discipline is to be so bounded by authority of Parliament, that it be not promiscuously put in the hands of all, but of such against whom there shall be no just exception found, yea are or shall be chosen by the Congregations themselves, who have also lately abjured by a solemn Covenant, the Popish and Prelatical Government?) Or whether we ought not to be more afraid and apprehensive that the Ordinances of Christ shall hardly be kept from pollution, and the Churches hardly purged from scandals, there being many thousands both grossely ignorant, and grossely scandalous?

4. I desire it may be (upon a review) seriously considered, how little truth, wisdom, or charity there is in that suggestion of Mr, *Prynn, pag.* 57. that the lives of the generality of the people are *more strict, pious, lesse scandalous and licentious in our English Congregations. Where there hath been powerful preaching, without the practice of Excommunication or suspension from the Sacrament, then in the Reformed Churches of* France, Germany, Denmark, *or* Scotland, *for which I appeal to all Travellers, &c.* I confesse it is a matter of great humiliation to the servants of Christ, that there is occasion to exercise Church discipline and censures in the Reformed Churches: yet this is no other then what was the condition of the Apostolique Churches. 2 *Cor.* 12. 21. *I fear* saith the Apostle *lest when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness, and fornication, and lasciviousnesse which they have committed.* And this is not the onely Testimony concerning scandals and disorderly walking in those primitive Churches. But as for those who are so rigid in their censures

censures against the government of the Reformed Churches, I answer to them as *Hierome* did of the *Montanists*. *They are rigid, not to the end that themselves also might not commit worse sins; but this difference there is between them and us, that they are ashamed to confesse their sins, as if they were righteous: We while We repent, do the more easily obtain mercy.* Mr. *Prynn* and others of his profession are not very willing that such an Ecclesiastical discipline be established in *England*, as is received and setled in *Scotland* and other Reformed Churches. But if once the like sin-searching, sin-discovering, and sin-censuring discipline were received and duely executed in *England*, then (and not till then) such comparisons may (if at all they must) be made, between the lives of the generality of the people in *England*, with those in other Reformed Churches, which of them is more or lesse licentious and scandalous.

Rigidi autem sunt, non quo & ipsi pejora non peccent: sed hoc inter nos & illos interest, quod illi erubescunt confiteri peccata, quasi justi: nos dum pœnitentiam agimus, facilius veniam promeremur.

A Testimony of Mr. Foxe *the Author of the Book of Martyrs, taken out of a treatise of his printed at* London, 1551. *entituled* De Censura Ecclesiastica Interpellatio J. Foxi, *the eighth Chapter of which Treatise is here translated out of Latin into English.*

What the are chief obstacles hindering Excommunication?

THat the thought and care of excommunication hath now so far waxed cold almost in all the Churches, is to be ascribed (as appeareth) unto three sorts of men. The first is of those whose minds the wealth of this world and high advancement of dignity do so lift up, that they are ashamed to submit the neck to the obedience of Christ. What (say these) shall that poor fellow lay a yoke on me? What, should I be subject to this naughty and rude Pastor? But let go, good Sir, your vain swelling empty words; how rude soever he be, yet if he be your Pastor, you must needs be a sheep of the flock, whom if he doth rightly instruct, so much the more dutifully you must submit. But if otherwise, it is the fault of the man, not of the Ministry; To those at least yeeld thy self to be ruled, whom thou knowest to

be more learned. But go to, thou which canst not suffer a man to be thy Pastor, to whom then wilt thou submit thy self? unto Christ himself (thou sayest:) very well forsooth. This then is of such importance, that Christ for thy cause must again leave the heavens, or by his Angels or Arch-Angels feed and govern thee, whom these mean men the Pastors do not satisfie: But what if it so pleased the Lord by these mean Pastors, as thou callest them, to cast down and confound all the highest statelynesse and pride of this World, even as of old by a few and contemptible Fishers he subdued not onely the high and conceited opinion of Philosophers, but even the Scepters of Kings also? Now what will thy boasting magnificence say? But hear what Christ himself saith of them, whom thou from thy high loftinesse lookest down upon as unworthy. *He that despiseth you despiseth me* (saith he.) And moreover who so despiseth Christ, despiseth him from whom he is sent, and who said unto him, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee: Ask of me and I will give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost ends of the earth for thy possession: Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron, and break them in peeces like a potters vessel.* Wherefore seeing thou dost acknowledge so great a Lord, so many wayes above all Majesty whatsoever can be named; let it not be grievous to thee (my brother whosoever thou art, or with how great power soever thou art highly advanced) laying aside thy high looks and pride, to be humbled under his mighty hand; And do not think it a light matter (whereas thou entertainest with so great applause and honourable respect an earthly Kings Ambassadors) that thou shouldst disdain the Ambassadors of him, who alone hath power over all Kings and Lords. If thou yeeldest unto a mortal Physitian thy wounds to be handled, yea to be cut also, and to be burned and seared (if need be) how commeth it, that thou canst lesse endure the same thing also in the curing of the diseases of the soul from the spiritual Physitian, especially seeing in so many respects better is the health of the soul then of the body? Nor do thou so account any whit in this regard to be impared of thy honour, if unto thy Bishop or Pastor, yea rather herein to Christ thou be subjected. Yea contrariwise, so account as the thing is indeed, that there is no true glory but in Christ and in his sheepfolds;

folds; that none do more prosperously reigne, then they which every way do serve him, without whom as there is no glory, so is there no safety and salvation. Neither let it seem disgraceful to thee, what so many ages ago the most high Monarchs of the world and most potent Emperors have done before thee: amongst whom *Philip*, as he was the first of all the Emperors who was made a Christian; so I meet with no other more famous example, and more worthy of all mens imitation. He willing to be present at the solemn Assemblies of the Church on Easter, and to communicate of the Sacrament, when as yet he was judged not worthy of admission; It is reported that *Fabian* the Bishop withstood him, neither did receive him before he confessed his sins, and stood among the Penitentiaries. What would those our proud gyants, fighters against God do here, if they had stood in the like condition and high place? But this no lesse mild then most mighty Emperor was nothing ashamed (forgetting in the mean while his Imperial Majesty) of his own accord to submit himself to the obedience of his Pastor, undergoing every thing whatsoever in the Name of Christ was imposed upon him. O truly noble Emperor, and no lesse worthy Bishop! But these examples in both are too rare amongst us this day.

Another sort is of those which would be Christians but in name and title onely, they promise an honest enough shew of Christian profession; they dispute both learnedly, and every where with great endeavour, of Christ; they carry about in their hands the Gospel; they frequent sacred Sermons; have cast off all superstition; they feed with the perfect; they marry, eat, and are clothed, so as they hold no difference either of times or of places. Finally, Whatsoever is pleasing in Christ they take and stiffely hold. But if ye look into their life, they are Epicures, Wasters, Ravenous, Covetous, Sons of Belial; Not Christs servants, but slaves of their belly; who according to the Satyrist, think vertue to be but words, as the wood to be but trees. And of these there is a great store every where, who seeing onely for their belly they follow Christ, they leave nothing undevised and uninterprised to hinder Excommunication, that so they may the more freely satisfie and serve their own lusts. So

the Covetous man feareth that his Covetousnesse be called in question, which he will not forsake. The Adulterer, he that buyeth or selleth men into slavery, the dycer, the whoremonger, the drunkard would rather his intemperance to be concealed. So the Robber, the Murderer, the Incendiary is afraid to be laid open or made known. So he that delighteth to be fatted and enriched with the dammages of the Common-wealth, is unwilling to have any bridle to curb and restrain him: The Cheater that with false wares beguileth the people; the seller that with unjust gain outeth counterfeit wares; the deceiver who cozeneth and circumventeth his Neighbour. Last of all whosoever are thus affected that they savour or follow nothing but their belly, their ambition, and the purse, they do not willingly endure that their liberty of sinning should be stopped to them.

Moreover after these, others not much unlike them, come into the same account, which out of some places of Scripture perversely wrested, if they find out ought that may flatter their affections, hence forthwith do they promise a wicked liberty of sinning to themselves and others, whence follows a very great corruption of life, together with injury of the Scripture. While these men are not sufficiently shaken and stricken with the fence of their sin, and force the Scripture violently wrested to defend and maintain their perverse affections, from which Scripture it had been meet to seek all medicines of their vices. But little do these men in the mean while consider how dear it cost Christ, which they make so small account of. They do not mark and weigh how horrible a thing sin is before God, which no otherwise could be expiate and purged but by the death of his onely begotten Son; which hath utterly ruinated not whole Cities, but Kingdoms also and Monarchies.

Which things if these and all other Epicures did more diligently think of, it would come to passe I suppose, that neither the custome of sin would so much like them, and withall the matter it self would so far draw them, that more willingly they would have recourse unto these so many waies wholsom remedies of the Church, as unto the onely medicine of mans life.

FINIS.

Sept 1654